DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 736 FL 024 693

AUTHOR	Kaiser, Linda Wojcikowski
TITLE	Essential Provisions for Elementary Foreign Language Programs.
PUB DATE	1996-00-00
NOTE	88p.; Masters of Education Essay, Wayne State University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); Community Support; Educational Objectives; Elementary Education; *Fles; *Language Teachers; Learning Theories; Parent Attitudes; Program Design; Program Evaluation; Relevance (Education); Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Second Language Programs; Student Evaluation; *Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Content Area Teaching

ABSTRACT

Using sources such as personal observation, personal communication, and published literature, this essay identifies issues that have accounted for Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools (FLES) programs' failure to survive. Seven essential elements of a successful foreign language program in the elementary school are identified and discussed: (1) setting realistic and appropriate goals and objectives and planning a program to meet them; (2) locating and retaining qualified teachers; (3) using age-appropriate and sound foreign language pedagogy; (4) adopted content based instruction as a foundation for relevance to the overall school program; (5) articulating FLES with middle and high school foreign language programs; (6) performing frequent student assessment and periodic program evaluation; and (7) cultivating parent and community awareness and support. The research draws on personal observation, personal communication, and published literature. Contains 78 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 736

Essential Provisions for Elementary Foreign Language Programs

By Linda Wojcikowski Kaiser

AN ESSAY SUBMITTED TO THE TEACHER EDUCATION DIVISION

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTERS OF EDUCATION

1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda
Wojcikowski Kaiser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024693

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This essay identifies and examines seven essential elements of elementary foreign language (FLES) programs: a) setting realistic and appropriate goals and objectives and planning a program that will meet those objectives; b) locating and retaining qualified teachers; c) using age-appropriate and sound foreign language pedagogies; d) adopting content-based instruction as foundation for relevance to the overall school program; e) articulating FLES with middle and secondary school foreign language programs; f) performing frequent student assessment and periodic program evaluation; g) cultivating parent and community awareness and support. The essay's sources include personal observation, personal communication, and published literature.

Essential Provisions for Elementary Foreign Language Programs

Background

In spite of budgetary cutbacks, failed methodologies and backlashes against things foreign, foreign language study in the United States has been expanding along two courses. First, the notion of *who* studies a foreign language in K-12 institutions has extended beyond an elite group of academically strong, secondary school students (Kennedy & De Lorenzo, 1985) to include *all* school age children from preschool to grade 12, including most children with learning and other disabilities (Andrade, Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989; Wing, 1996; Spinelli, 1996).

The second course of expansion in foreign language (FL) education involves the goals and expectations we, as FL educators, have for our enlarged, more diverse student population. This expansion of expectations has its impetus in the evolution of FL teaching methodologies and is realized as our profession strives to put hard won advances in language acquisition theory into practice. Moreover, FL education, like many endeavors in education, in industry, and in the marketplace, is being held accountable for the hours and moneys it costs. Public support of FL study for children of any age is based upon the perceived relevance of its product and the success of its methodologies.

There is much evidence that proficiency in foreign languages among Americans has been insufficient to meet our country's needs. Our national security and our nation's ability to compete in a global marketplace depend on our citizens' ability to communicate and understand communications worldwide. One need not look far to find calls by our state and national leaders

for more opportunities in FL study for American students, in order to meet the expanding need for FL proficiency by our citizens in a shrinking world.

As far back as 1979, the report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, entitled "Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of US Capability", found shocking insufficiencies in our nation's FL capabilities: "...our lack of foreign language competence diminishes our capabilities in diplomacy, in foreign trade, and in citizen comprehension of the world in which we live and compete" ("Strength through wisdom", p. 12).

There are countless examples of how, before and since the President's Commission's Report in 1979, insufficiencies in our citizens abilities to speak and understand foreign languages have hurt our economy or placed our national security in jeopardy. Perhaps the most well known linguistic faux pas made by an American company is when General Motors Corporation attempted to market an automobile in Latin America, named the "Nova", which translates in speech to "it doesn't run" in Spanish. It is not surprising sales of the model did not take off until its name was changed. On the diplomatic front, Presidents Nixon and Carter both had to rely upon Chinese interpreters in political and trade negotiations instead of Americans proficient in Chinese (Hoegl, 1984). Moedinger's "Summary Report: Bilingual Vacancies in Los Angeles County",as cited in Munks 1996, reports that "...in 1992, the County of Los Angeles could not find qualified, use-oriented speakers of Spanish and English to fill nearly 500 vacant jobs posted as Spanish bilingual" (p. 3). These are but a few examples of the price we Americans pay for our collective monoligualism.

In 1994, AT&T, in response to the astounding growth of its 24 hour a day, 7 day a week interpreter service, Language Line, established the International Multilingual Center in San Jose.

The Center is staffed around the clock by people who speak a dozen or so of the most frequently requested languages to serve businesses needing interpreters and translators for their international markets. Jeffrey Munks, of AT&T Government Affairs, in his paper to the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, calls for

> breaking, once and for all, the prevailing paradigm that views language study and use as a 'nice to have'... [when] evidence emerging from all across the landscape suggests that language study and use is achieving a societal 'need to have' status that is no different from engineering, medicine, science or any other core discipline. (1996, p. 19)

Government recognition of FL as a core discipline may be at last catching up to current realities: FL is one of seven core subjects named in *Goals 2000*, our national education goals for the year 2000.

For those of us who support early FL study, that is FL study beginning before the traditional age of around fourteen years of age, the onus is not only to prove that the product of FL study is relevant, but that teaching FL to children in grades kindergarten through eight is worthwhile.

One logical reason for starting to learn a language early is the sheer number of hours it takes to learn one. Omaggio (1986) gives us an idea of how long it takes to master a FL. According to figures she cites which were compiled by the United States Department of Defense Foreign Service Institute, it takes an average, non-gifted learner 720 hours of training to attain a 2+ or advanced level in the easiest group of languages for native English speakers to master. The easiest languages include Afrikaans, Danish, Dutch, French, Haitian Creole, Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish, Swahili and Swedish. At the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), training is intensive and the 720 hours are completed in 24 weeks. At the rate of one hour of class a day, five days a week, a high school student would take over three and one half years to

spend the same number of hours in training, and few high schools would offer the same intensity of training during the hours spent. Even for a motivated, professional adult, trained at what is perhaps the best language training center in the country, the level attained after 720 hours is not a consistent, professional or superior level of proficiency. To reach the same level in Russian or Turkish, more difficult languages, takes 1320 hours at the FSI. For Chinese, Arabic, Japanese or Korean, an average learner in the same type of FSI course would have to spend 2400-2760 hours of intensive training to reach a low superior level of proficiency. Given the number of hours required to learn a FL, it is understandable why Munks of AT&T says American students of FL are "hamstrung from the beginning" because of the late start they get.

Goals 2000 tacitly endorses elementary FL when it includes FL in the core subjects in which American students will demonstrate competencies in grades *four*, eight and twelve; some study before grade four would be necessary to develop competencies by that point. In response to Goals 2000, the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has outlined a set of broad performance standards for those grades in the context of three sequences: an early start/extended sequence for grades 3-12, a shortened sequence for grades 5-12 and a traditional four-year program for grades 9-12 ("Standards proposed," 1992).

The product of early FL study must be valued and recognized as relevant in order for programs to be viable. Further, programs must succeed in delivering the product promised, whether that be proficient speakers of FLs or something different. Elementary school programs initiated during the last period of intense interest in FL in the elementary school (FLES), in the late 1950s and the 1960s, did not succeed in delivering what they promised. The interest in FLES had been sparked by a wave of national concern about US capabilities to function as a

world power, after the United States failed to intercept news of Russian plans for the first Sputnik satellite launch in 1957. The behavioral psychologists who at that time dominated many branches of thought, including language learning and language acquisition theory, held that language was above all a habit and the earlier the habit was reinforced, the better (Schinke-Llano, 1985). When the widely practiced Skinnerian audio-lingual method proved generally unsuccessful in producing proficient FL speakers, the momentum for FL study in the elementary school was lost and most FLES programs were abandoned. In addition to methodology, problems such as poor planning, lack of qualified teachers, lack of program articulation and others hastened FLES' demise. Hence the tempered advocacy of early FL education evident in the language used in "Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of US Capabilities":

> We also urge that language study begin in the early grades, but note that its effectiveness depends upon the time devoted to it, a supportive atmosphere, well-trained teachers and the careful integration of early language instruction with higher levels of instruction. (p. 19)

Although mistakes were made in the FLES programs of the 1950s and 60s, much was learned. The 70s and early 80s were a low point for FLES in terms of enrollment; however, there were substantial advancements in second language acquisition theory made during that period which have implications for elementary FL education. Also, studies on the linguistic and non-linguistic benefits of early language learning began to amount to a considerable body research. These advancements, combined with the hard-earned experience of the post-Sputnik heyday of FLES, give today's FLES educators the opportunity to offer students much more in terms of quality FL education than was possible in the past.

One area relevant to FLES studied in the 70s and 80s was optimal age for initiation of FL study. Why, after all, should a community bother with teaching children FLs? Language learning

researchers have determined that, contrary to popular belief, adult and adolescent language learners have cognitive advantages in language learning over young children (Krashen, Scarcella & Long, 1982). Furthermore, some studies show that adults and older children, aged 12-15, are actually better mimics than young children (Snow & Hoefnagel-Höhle, 1977, 1978; Olson & Samuels, 1973). On the other hand, children do have advantages over adults in achieving native-like pronunciation when arriving in an adopted country (Asher & Garcia, 1969).

Nevertheless, childhood is the optimal age for second language learning, if not in the cognitive or physical domain, in the affective domain. According to Krashen, perhaps the most influential language acquisition theorist of our time, language acquisition, or subconscious language learning, takes place "in only one way--by understanding messages, or by receiving 'comprehensible imput'. We progress along the natural order...by understanding imput that contains structures at our next stage--structures that are a bit beyond our current level of competence" (Krashen, 1982, p. 2). Further, Krashen states:

> Comprehensible imput is necessary for acquisition, but it is not sufficient. The acquirer needs to be 'open' to the imput. The 'affective filter' is a mental block that prevents acquirers from fully utilizing the comprehensible imput they receive for language acquisition. (p. 3)

The filter is up when "the acquirer is unmotivated, lacking in self-confidence, or anxious" and down when he is "not concerned with the possibility of failure in language acquisition and when he considers himself to be a potential member of the group speaking the target language" (Krashen, 1982, p. 3-4). Precisely because they are pre-operational thinkers, children have less affective constraints or inhibitions as acquirers of language than adults or adolescents (Krashen, 1982b).

Other than factors favoring language acquisition and the eventual development of language proficiency, early foreign language study provides additional benefits to children. These additional benefits include improved cognitive skills, evaluation skills (Foster & Reeves, 1988), non-verbal problem solving abilities (Bamford, 1991) and figural creativity (Landry, 1973). Other benefits named in the literature and supported by research are: improved-self concept (Genesee, 1987, Masciantonio, 1977); a sense of cultural pluralism and a higher tolerance for differences among people (Carpenter & Torney, 1973; Lambert & Klienberg, 1967); and higher test scores in reading, math and other subjects (Schinke-Llano, 1985; Andrade, Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989). Müller (1989, p. 223) cites Garfinkle & Tabor whose studies showed that low achievers as well as high achievers benefit academically from FLES, and these results are corroborated elsewhere (Andrade, Kretschmer & Kretschmer, 1989). Also, early FL study has a favorable effect on later FL study (Lipton, 1992), and, although there is not a great deal of research data available, there is some indication from research that former FLES students do outperform their peers who take high school FL only, particularly when the FLES students are offered a continuing track at the secondary level (Schinke-Llano, 1985).

The early language programs that have been implemented since the late 1970s have taken on a wide array of forms, with almost as many program models as there have been programs. Lipton (1992) identifies three basic K-6 formats or program types which she collectively names FLES*. Curtain & Pesola (1994), basing their schema on a 1993 description by Rhodes, refer to K-6 FL programs as "early foreign language programs" and distinguish five types which differ from one another both in goals and in the percent of class time spent in the foreign language per week (p. 30).

The basic forms of early FL programs are: *Sequential FLES*, which "has as its major focus the teaching of one language for two or more school years. The goal is to provide instruction in the four skills: listening (understanding), speaking, reading and writing as well as cultural awareness"(Lipton, 1992, p. 4). Sequential FLES corresponds roughly to what program designers in the 60s called FLES. Curtain & Pesola (1994) distinguish *Content-enriched FLES*, in which students learn district curriculum content in the FL and the language simultaneously, for 15-50 percent of their class time; and "FLES", with goals similar to Lipton's Sequential FLES, with 5-15 percent of class time and "a minimum of 75 minutes per week, at least every other day"(p. 30).

Lipton and Curtain & Pesola agree on the criteria for immersion and partial immersion programs: the goal of both program types is the attainment high level of proficiency in the FL and mastery of content goals with the FL used as the medium of instruction. Both Lipton and Curtain & Pesola require 50 percent of class time spent in the FL for *partial immersion* programs. Curtain & Pesola require 50-100 percent for *total immersion* programs, and according to Lipton, total immersion is defined by "close to 100 percent" of the school day in the target language (1992, p. 6). In total immersion programs, introduction of English language arts is usually delayed until the third grade (Lipton, 1992; Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

Curtain & Pesola also include *two-way immersion* or *bilingual immersion* in their description of programs. This type of program is only possible in a community which has a sizable linguistic minority population and an English-speaking population interested in their children acquiring the native language of that minority population. The goals, materials, strategies and time in spent in the target language in two-way immersion are similar to those of

partial immersion. The chief differences from other immersion programs is that the learning environment always has one group of students learning content in a language that is not the native language of the group, and students have peers to rely on as native-speaking linguistic models in the target language.

Finally, both guides mention *FL exploratory* or *FLEX*. FLEX is an introduction to language learning, usually conducted in English, for anywhere from one semester to two years. Typically, FLEX program goals are to motivate students to consider further FL study, to increase awareness and appreciation of cultural and linguistic differences among peoples, and, in some cases, to enhance awareness of the English language. Though sometimes taught at the K-5 level, FLEX is commonly taught in the middle school in districts where elementary school FL is not available. According to Kennedy & De Lorenzo (1985) and Curtain & Pesola (1994), FLEX has four basic varieties: (a)*language potpourri*, in which students learn a limited amount of vocabulary in several languages; (b) *general language*, in which little language learning takes place. Students study instead about communication theory, language diversity and language use in the world, and relationships between the English and other languages; (c) the *single language offering*, defined as "a limited introductory experience in one language that students may later be able to choose for sequential study" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 37); and (d) a combination of language potpourri and general language. Lipton considers FLEX part of FLES*. Curtain & Pesola do not consider most FLEX programs to be on the same footing with other types of early FL programs, because they are usually not sequential, not integrated into a K-12 sequence and "students do not attain any degree of language proficiency [in them]" (1994, p. 35). Curtain & Pesola admit that some FLEX programs can rightfully be called FL courses because they include enough high-quality language learning experiences to warrant an altered FL curriculum at the

next grade level in order to prevent students from being treated as complete beginners. Curtain & Pesola withhold the same denomination from FLEX courses that are taught in English; they "would best be considered as part of the social studies or English language arts curriculum instead of the foreign language curriculum" (1994, p. 36).

For the purposes in this paper, I will use the acronym *FLES*, which stands for "foreign language in the elementary school" encompass nearly all of Curtain & Pesola's and Lipton's program descriptions. Here FLES will denote (a) the versions of FLEX which contain high-quality language learning experiences, (b) sequential FLES, (c) content-enriched or intensive FLES, (d) partial immersion and (e) total immersion. I will not discuss bilingual or two-way immersion, per se, although many considerations affecting partial and total immersion programs also apply to bilingual or two way immersion. Although I find it useful at times to discuss what Curtain & Pesola (1994) call *auxiliary language programs* or *non-curricular programs*--those programs that take place outside of the school day -- I do not mean to include them when I use the term FLES.

Fortunately, the calls to action by educators, government, and researchers have not gone unheeded. FLES programs have been enjoying a revival: six states have mandated foreign language study for all children before grade nine, and five states offer financial incentives to districts that plan FLES programs. Still, some of the same mistakes that plagued the programs of the 1950s and 60s continue to cause FLES programs of the 1990s to be less effective than they could be (Heining-Boyton, 1990; Lipton, 1992; Rosenbusch, 1995). In our schools, programs in FL at all levels "continue, as they have always been, to be among the most lightly funded when compared to other academic disciplines" (Munks, 1996, p. 2).

There are also new pressures in today's elementary schools. Most important, perhaps, is the competition for inclusion in the overall elementary program among subjects formally not part of the elementary school, such as computer education and drug awareness training, There is also an impression among some stake holders in the elementary school that inclusion of foreign language in the elementary school day will take away from the "essentials" (Wing , 1996; p. 41). Wing quotes Dvorak's 1995 report on a survey of how FL study is viewed by 110 disparate players in the community: "On one hand, foreign language study was definitely viewed as important and valuable and deserving a place within the curriculum....On the other hand, most people felt foreign languages were not as important as other academic subjects" (Wing, 1996, pp. 40-41).

Problem Statement

In spite of all of the good reasons that children should begin learning FLs well before high school, early FL programs are left vulnerable to the budgetary ax in periods of district financial difficulties The valuable lessons of the 1960s FLES program failures, more recent research in language acquisition practices and theory, and effort from the profession publish and reach sometimes isolated colleagues all point to a number of measures and provisions schools and school districts must assure in order for elementary FL programs to survive and thrive.

Purpose Of The Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the issues that have accounted for elementary school FL (FLES) programs' failure to survive and to shed light upon the considerations district planners and teachers must make in order to not repeat the same set of problems that have plagued elementary FL programs in the past.

Significance

This study can serve as a clearinghouse for people interested in developing FLES and immersion programs or strengthening the viability of existing programs. Conclusions extracted from this study may ultimately save school districts from wasting precious time, funds,and good will devoted to early FL programs.

Research Questions

What are the measures and provisions experience tells us individual schools and school districts must make, in order for elementary foreign language programs to thrive? With those specific measures in mind, what does research tell us about effective implementation of elementary foreign language programs in the 1990s?

Review Of Literature

Identifying Crucial Provisions

According to Lipton (1990) the reasons for the demise of FLES programs of the 1960s were:

> 1. FLES programs promised too much linguistic fluency in too short a time.
> 2. FLES programs grew too rapidly, without careful planning.
> 3. Very few secondary school teachers supported the program, and there was little articulation.
> 4. There were few "qualified" teachers--either their language skills were limited or their knowledge of the elementary school was nonexistent.
> 5. There were too many songs, dances, games, and the students themselves were not aware they were making any language progress.
> 6. The "cultural island" philosophy separated the program from the rest of the curriculum, although there were some attempts to integrate the language learning with art, music, science, mathematics, social studies, physical education and others. (p. 256)

Heining-Boyton lists six reasons "beyond the issues of money, changes in curricular priorities, and contempt for that which is foreign [that] emerge as causes for the disappearance of FLES. They are: (a) lack of qualified teachers,(b) unrealistic program goals; (c) incompatible pedagogy; (d)lack of articulation; (e) lack of homework, grades, and evaluation; and (f) lack of parent support" (1990, p. 504).

Rosenbusch (1995, June) cautions districts planning programs to beware of factors that led to the demise of programs of the 50s and 60s because "these factors continue to be a challenge to program viability today." She lists:

> 1. lack of teachers with sufficient language skills and qualifications to teach language to young students;
> 2. programs inadequate in design and without the necessary funding;
> 3. inappropriate or unrealistic program goals;
> 4. lack of coordination and articulation across levels of instruction;
> 5 inappropriate teaching methodologies for young children; inadequate and insufficient instructional materials; and
> 6. lack of evaluation procedures for students, teachers, and the program. (p. 1).

Realistic and Appropriate Goals and Objectives; Planning a Program That Will Meet Those Objectives

Goals and objectives. According to Curtain & Pesola many FLES programs in the 1960s "gained public support for the wrong reasons [like]'catching up' with the Russians...[or] trying to produce fluent speakers quickly because they were thought to be at the optimal age for language learning" (1994, p. 1). The disappointment with those programs could often have been avoided had realistic goals and objectives been set before starting the programs. When program planners fail to develop rationales and program philosophies that are based on what research shows to be true, the school community may form expectations based upon false assumptions, such as the widely held belief that children learn languages more easily then adults. Research-backed rationales for teaching foreign language in the elementary school provide the only reasonable source of program goals and objectives (Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

The National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Language, together with the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), in their joint statement on FL studies in elementary schools, maintain that "the best foreign language programs in the elementary schools will result from a careful study of the outcomes desired by each local district and its citizens" (Lipton, 1992, p. 15). Though learning language is often considered by communities and program planners to be the most important goal of FLES programs, language proficiency is not the only benefit of early language study, and therefore, not the only reasonable goal for program planners to set.

A basic rule of thumb for all districts, regardless of their location, funding, or even what they call their program is stated by Curtain & Pesola:

> Underlying every program description...is the fact that language proficiency outcomes are directly proportional to the amount of time spent by students in meaningful communication in the target language. The more time students spend working communicatively with the target language, under the guidance of a skilled and fluent teacher, the greater will be the level of language proficiency that they acquire. (1994, p. 30-31)

Curtain & Pesola agree with Met & Rhodes (1990) that the *intensity* of the learning experience is also a factor that will affect language acquisition. The length of individual sessions must be long enough, though, to complete interesting activities that create a "need to know" situation from which communication will arise.

Rosenbusch (1985) and Lipton (1990) both note that proficiency in the target language may not be the stress or ultimate goal of a district. Rosenbusch describes a rural setting, in Ames, Iowa, in which the community wanted (a) to introduce children to other languages and cultures; and (b) to show the children their potential for communicating in other languages, two goals that Rosenbusch notes are more difficult to achieve in Iowa than in many other places in the US. In this district, a 45-minute, twice-a-week, before-school, non-curricular French, German and Spanish program, paid for by interested parents and staffed by community volunteers, accomplished the community's goals. Curtain & Pesola (1994) note that in communities with such non-curricular or auxiliary programs, the interest in FL generated eventually led to inclusion of FL in the school day and in the curriculum. They also admit that some districts would have no elementary FL without the reliance on community resources like volunteers. Curtain & Pesola still caution that "such programs place languages clearly *outside* of the school curriculum and the school day, reinforcing the notion that language learning is an 'extra' rather than a basic component" (1994, p. 38).

It is possible for a district to have modest but specific language proficiency goals with a limited program, in which students neither meet with a language teacher daily nor study in an immersion program. Wing (1996) describes such a program in the Putnam City Schools, in Oklahoma City. Putnam City's program and its goals are in part determined by Oklahoma House Bill 1017, which mandates that all Oklahoma children must have an exploratory language course in grades K-3 and that they must achieve a novice high proficiency level, according to ACTFL Guidelines, by grade 8. After a four-year Japanese FLEX program, students spend thirty minutes, three days a week studying Spanish in grades 4 and 5, and then continue studying Spanish 45 minutes daily in grades 6-8. To staff the program, classroom teachers were trained to teach Japanese FLEX ; for the sequential FLES component, 20 new Spanish teachers were hired to staff the district's 18 elementary schools and 5 middle schools. A district coordinator was also hired to oversee training and program implementation.

As school districts aim for a higher degree of proficiency, the commitment of students' time in the FL grows (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). Munks (1996) offers an idea of what a high level of FL proficiency demands with his description of competency-based programs: "[Competency-based programs] focus on producing competent speakers of target languages. As rigorous and structured as any of the hard disciplines, these programs typically require either a long term commitment, an intense or compressed immersion dimension, or some combination of the two" (p. 9).

If a district's goal is a high level of second language proficiency for the majority, if not all of its students, immersion programs provide more of the theoretical requirements for second language acquisition and more favorable research evidence, from both Canadian and American classrooms, than any other program model. Moreover, early total immersion programs, programs

that begin in kindergarten or first grade, have more consistently favorable results in research on English and math and science achievement than do partial immersion and late immersion programs, according to studies cited in Schinke-Llano (1985). Schinke-Llano hypothesizes though that the results favoriing early, total immersion could have been due to program design rather than the age and grade at which students begin their immersion experiences and the percentage of the school day spent in a foreign language

In comparisons between sequential FLES, partial immersion, total immersion and high school FL students in achievement in French and Spanish language, a study by Gray, Rhodes, Campbell, and Snow (1984) indicates that immersion students scored higher more often in all areas tested, speaking, listening , reading, and writing, using a Modern Language Association (MLA) testing instrument. The study, though, was taken to task by Lipton, who reminds us that, when it comes to comparing proficiency of students exiting programs that stress internationalism or cultural awareness with that of students in an immersion program, researchers are comparing "apples and oranges" (Lipton, 1990, p. 257), because immersion students spend so much more time in the target language than do students in other types of programs.

Though immersion programs demand a great deal of commitment from students and their families, they may actually be less costly than sequential FLES or FLEX, because the required personnel in addition to the classroom teacher is limited (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). The classroom teacher *is* the language teacher. Many immersion programs do hire additional teacher's aids who are non-certified native speakers of the target language. Their role is to increase the ratio of target language speakers to students and to assist in adapting materials for instruction, a potentially costly area of immersion programs. Also to consider: introduction of immersion programs can cause contention from existing staff, who often must be displaced to

accommodate bilingual peers. For this and other reasons, including maintaining a target language environment throughout the school, immersion programs are popular in large districts with magnet school programs. Magnet schools make up 47% of US immersion schools according to Fortune & Jorstad's 1996 survey of US immersion schools.

For all its superior linguistic and non-linguistic results, in comparison with other elementary program types, and in comparison with secondary FL programs, immersion, in and of itself, does not produce native-like speakers and writers of foreign languages; however, in the receptive skills, listening and reading, after six or seven years, immersion students achieved average performance in comparison with native speakers (Swain & Lapkin, 1982). Schinke-Llano (1985, p. 26) cites Plan's unpublished 1976 findings that in the productive skills, speaking and writing, immersion students have been observed to develop a sort of classroom pidgin or dialect, reinforcing each other's errors.

To cite all of the pros and cons mentioned in the literature for each program type is beyond the scope of this paper. Information on program types is abundant in the literature; however, *research studies* that give comparative results, in terms of language proficiency gains, between programs are not. This lack is perhaps in part due to the less than adequate dissemination and use of available and appropriate FLES testing instruments. Also, as Lipton points out, comparing test results of programs with very different goals may not yield conclusions that are particularly useful.

Tegarden and Brown (1989) describe realistic expectations of linguistic outcomes in this way:

> Administrators and parents do need to keep in mind that not every student who begins a language in elementary school will become a superior speaker of the language. Being a superior speaker of a Romance language takes as much time and effort as being a superior mathematician, economist, scientist, or author. Superior speakers are born into

> bilingual environments, immersed in a language at a young age, or study another language in primary school through college, and they travel and study abroad. Just as only a small percentage of elementary school students become superior mathematicians or scientists, a small percentage of Americans will be able to carry forth in a second language as well as an educated native speaker of that language. (p. 83)

The national content standards, developed by ACTFL for the national educational goals, *Goals 2000*, give districts planning programs a framework for what may be reasonably expected from FLES programs a framework to which many, many FL educators brought experience to bear. The document, *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century Standards* presents "five C's of Foreign Language Study": communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities, and conceptualizes them in a "weave" of curricular elements, with language system, cultural knowledge, communication strategies, critical thinking skills, learning strategies, other subject areas, and technology. The conceptual framework the *Standards* document offers is particularly valuable to districts planning sequential or content-enriched FLES programs, and, to a lesser degree, other FLES program types, because it includes many of the "other" content areas that correspond to the goals and rationales that communities often have for their FLES programs.

Planning a program. Most scholars who write on planning programs agree on three imperatives: (a) programs must be planned well in advance of implementation with the community's needs in mind; (b) program planners must read the research to be familiar with the results they are likely to get with the type of program they choose, or to know what type of program they need in order to produce the results they want (Lipton, 1992) and (c) communication to the community about district goals and rationales for having a program and begin immediately and progress must be publicized on a regular basis (Schinke-Llano, 1985; Rosenbusch, 1991; Lipton, 1992; Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

Prevalent in the literature is the idea that the first step needed in advance planning of a FLES program is establishment of a steering committee, preferably by a team comprising members of each group of stake holders: parents, teachers from existing FL programs within the district, teachers familiar with elementary school setting, and district and building administrators Rosenbusch even recommends including individuals who are opposed to the program on the committee "so that the committee can understand and develop responses to opposition. In some cases committee members who were of the opposition become staunch supporters, strengthening the case for an elementary school program "(1991, p. 298).

Schinke-Llano names three responsibilities of the steering committee:

> 1. to become well informed about the nature of early foreign language programs, including the advantages and the limitations of each type;
> 2. to serve as an information gathering body regarding the particular needs and resources of the school district; and
> 3. to develop a detailed plan of the proposed program to submit to parents, teachers, and administrators for approval. (1985, p. 32)

Rosenbusch (1991) offers these suggested activities for a steering committee's "plan of action":

> 1. research the rationale for elementary school foreign language programs;
> 2. evaluate the existing foreign language program;
> 3. examine program models and outcomes;
> 4. explore articulation models:
> 5. inform the public and the school system of the rationale, program models, and the outcome and the articulation models;
> 6. determine the support of the public and the school system for an expanded foreign language program and for the various program and articulation models;
> 7. prepare a feasibility study of the most promising program models for the local situation; and
> 8. recommend a program model and a long-range plan for implementation of the program. (1991, p. 298-299)

To become informed, Schinke-Llano (1985) recommends members read as much as possible on programs, visit existing programs and consider hiring a consultant to instruct the

committee and present the program to groups of parents, teachers, and administrators. Rosenbusch mentions the Educational Resources Information Center/Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC/CLL), professional books, journals, and newsletters, professional conferences and professional communication as good sources of information on FLES programs (1991, p. 300).

Planners must be familiar with research in order to set objectives and plan for a program that will meet those objectives. Program goals and objectives need to be determined in terms of degree of proficiency expected, emphasis on cultural understanding, presence or absence of English language explanations or "general language" element, particularly in FLEX programs. Compatibility of objectives, in terms of what will be taught and learning outcomes, with program goals should be carefully examined, according to Schinke-Llano (1985). She cites a lack of delineation between goals and objectives as one of the reasons for the demise of programs in the past, when programs promised too much in terms of proficiency. Oller (1989) also alludes to this problem when he points out that all of the sequential FLES and immersion programs surveyed in Rhodes and Oxford's 1988 national survey had as an implicit goal "some degree of communicative competence" while Rhodes and Oxford found that only about 3% of elementary schools responding had programs which could offer hope of delivery on this promise.

Other program decisions affecting goals and objectives, those involving the who? (which students? at what grade level?), when? (during the school day? after or before school?), how often? and for how long? need to be made during the planning phase of implementation (Lipton, 1992; Schinke-Llano, 1985).

Evaluating a district's existing FL program is an important step in planning a FLES program, according to Rosenbusch (1991), both in order to articulate the FLES program with upper grade levels and to build upon existing strengths of the FL program. The involvement of secondary FL teachers is crucial to identify information to be reviewed, gather statistics about enrollment and achievement and provide descriptions of methodologies and materials in use.

Teachers, says Schinke-Llano, should also be surveyed for their attitudes and support of an elementary FL program and how they envision their role or participation in a future program. For administrators, Schinke-Llano prefers short interviews with individuals to questionnaires, or, following a presentation to administrators by the steering committee, that the committee "request a detailed statement of support of the administrators" (Schinke-Llano, 1985, p. 35).

Community input and communication to the community should begin during planning stages. To determine the support and needs of the community, many authors recommend that the steering committee conduct a survey or questionnaire to determine how important parents believe FL instruction at the elementary level is (Schinke-Llano, 1985). Tegarden & Brown (1989) recommend districts planning a FLES program undertake a needs assessment or curriculum survey only *after* the planning committee or task force have taken in information about the district, identified potential obstacles, communicated rationales for implementing a FLES program in their district to all concerned and a majority of the community has information about FLES: "If surveys are distributed too early in the process, the recipients may not have enough information to make informed comments. One sure way to kill the concept of [foreign language] program expansion is to survey a negative or uninformed public" (p. 87). Schinke-Llano (1985) recommends that questionnaires include program type descriptions "to illustrate how specific goals are matched to program types" (p. 34).

Few articles or books deal with a topic that is prominent in the minds of program planners: how to estimate the cost of implementing a program; neither are funding issues, in general, discussed in detail in the literature. Yet, in Heining-Boyton's 1988 survey of Michigan FLES programs, lack of moneys was most frequently cited by teachers as the reason their program goals were not being met. Rosenbusch recommends a feasibility study as one of the action steps for the steering committee. She uses Curtain & Pesola's (1988) and Met's (1990) articles to name factors to consider when estimating start-up costs in determining program feasibility. For FLEX or FLES, start-up costs include "realia, materials, resource books, sample curriculum guides, audiovisual equipment, and library books" (1991, p. 301), plus salary costs for teachers, roughly one teacher per 200 students.

Immersion program start-up costs include: "the purchase of target-language materials for all elements of classroom instruction and library resources, some of which may need to be imported" (1991, p. 301). Salary costs are for native-speaking aides for at least part of the day for each classroom. Fortune & Jorstad's 1996 survey indicated that of 79 immersion schools responding, 82% used aides.

Additional costs for all models include teacher and aide fringe benefits, training, planning time for collaboration between FL teacher and classroom teachers (FLES and FLEX only), and curriculum development (Met, 1990).

Administrators who make decisions about budget, scheduling and space allocation for the district should be brought in once estimates for various program models have been made, according to Rosenbusch, to help develop a feasibility plan "for expansion through at least a five-year period" (1990, p. 301). As for recommended parameters for time allotment, Curtain & Pesola (1994) give an optimal minimum and a basic minimum. For optimal learning to take

place "*FLES programs should meet for a minimum of twenty to thirty minutes per day, five days per week*" (p. 266), and for a basic minimum Curtain & Pesola concur with the opinion of the participants in the 1991 Colloquium on Foreign Languages in the Elementary School Curriculum, reported by Rosenbusch (1992): "the minimum time allotment for a program to bear the FLES designation should be seventy-five minutes a week, scheduled no less than every other day" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 266). As for space for FLES and FLEX, Curtain & Pesola prefer a classroom be allocated for FL to allow easy access to the many hands-on materials and realia needed to create a context-rich FL-learning environment. On the other hand, one advantage of the traveling teacher that I have not read about in the literature, but have heard in steering committee meetings,is that if children themselves do not have to travel, there is more time for language learning and less complaining about an over-crowded school day. The final report to the steering committee should include two plans: a) a realistic plan, describing time and space allocation and estimating costs, and b) another plan that is free of constraints to allow for "vision of an ideal program" (Rosenbusch, 1990, p. 302).

As for sources of funding, Schinke-Llano (1985) believes that a steering committee mustn't fail to investigate funding sources outside of the school. For example, a fee can be charged of parents if classes are after or before school, or a corporate sponsor in the international business community can be sought.

The final decision and task of a steering committee is usually to make a recommendation to school administrators or to the board of education. Rosenbusch (June, 1995) says of the recommendation:

> This final decision may be a difficult one to make. If the district is not willing to make a serious commitment to developing a strong foreign language program, the steering committee must be ready to recommend that no elementary school program be established at the present time. Experience demonstrates that it is difficult to change a

> weak program design for a strong one once a program has been established. A weak program design will not allow students to develop high levels of proficiency in the language. (p. 2)

Qualified Teachers

In books and articles which include wish lists or calls for change in the future, there is generally some attention given to the need for university teacher training programs (Met, 1990; Met & Rhodes 1990). Pesola and Curtain (1989, p. 3) name the "trendiness" of FLES as a culprit causing the lack of qualified teachers: few if any universities will invest in the development of teacher education programs for school programs that are not well-established. Met notes that, at least as of 1989, it was "virtually impossible for an undergraduate to major simultaneously in elementary education and pursue sufficient coursework in foreign language that would result in a high level of foreign language proficiency" (1989b, p. 176). Consequently most teachers of FLES have had one deficit or another vis-à-vis their teaching assignment. In Rhodes and Oxford's 1988 survey of FLES nationwide, "only 26 percent of the responding elementary schools reported that all of their [foreign language] teachers were certified for foreign language teaching at the elementary level" (p. 55).

Staffing. An individual teacher of FLES might be a qualified elementary classroom teacher with knowledge of age-appropriate pedagogy and the elementary school learner, but a less than ideal FL model for his or her students. Indeed, during the 50s and 60s, districts rushing to include FL in their offerings sometimes required elementary classroom teachers to teach foreign languages against their will, creating poor ambassadors for FL study (Andersson, 1969). Rhodes, Tucker, & Clark (1981) report that a successful FLEX program in Evansville, IL was staffed by classroom teachers who received two days training, materials and tapes. Pesola & Curtain hold that "only teachers who are themselves fluent speakers of the target language and

who have meaningful personal experiences in the target culture will be capable of developing and teaching in programs which make the most of [FLES's] potential" (1989, p. 12).

Conversely, many elementary FL teachers and curriculum developers are transplanted secondary FL teachers. The literature, while not condemning the practice outright, warns program designers and administrators of the possible hazards of this arrangement: "teachers, including foreign language teachers, need to be knowledgeable about the stages through which children progress so that they can make curriculum developmentally appropriate" (Chapman, Grob, and Haas, 1989, p. 27). Lipton (1992) favors "certified elementary school teacher[s] with a high level of foreign language proficiency" or if this combination of qualifications is not available, certified FL teachers who have had a FLES methods course and at least nine credits of elementary methods courses. Skinner reports that Michigan is but one of many states that included FLES in their core curriculum and/or gave incentives to districts to start programs in the past few years. The Michigan Board of Education, like others, relaxed certification rules to let interested secondary teachers temporarily teach FL in elementary schools, recognizing the shortage of fluent FL-speaking elementary teachers (1992, p. 4).

Use of volunteers-- community members, college FL majors, education majors with FL knowledge or fluency, and use of third and fourth year high school students --to staff FLES programs gets mixed reviews in the literature. Skinner (1992) cites a personal experience in which students who had had a smattering of Spanish taught to them by a community volunteer began their new FLES program with an attitude of indifference, believing the new program would be nothing more than what the previous few lessons had been. Warning against use of volunteers in general she muses: "We would never consider having high school calculus students teach elementary math, but for some reason anyone who knows a little Spanish is perceived as

qualified to teach it" (p. 5). Skinner further warns that use of "translation methodology" by well-meaning but untrained volunteers can be particularly detrimental to program efforts to use target language only.

On the other hand, many reports of positive impact on FL study are reported by districts using non-certified teachers when those teachers are trained, upper level high school language students and advanced language students from local universities. Bagg, Oates & Zucker (1984) report that a Spanish program in Cedar Falls (Iowa) Public Schools that offered one session per week to K-6 students, who were screened by counselors for academic strength, staffed entirely by college students who had had at least three semesters of college Spanish or equivalent, who received one university credit by participating. The college student/teachers "met bi-weekly to share techniques and lesson plans" and developed a resource file that was made available to subsequent teachers. The program had no proficiency goals, but Cedar Falls High School, which had no language requirement at that time, generally had two fourth-year Spanish classes and the writers attribute some of that enthusiasm for FL study to the FLES program. One key to this program's continuity and success seemed to be another volunteer: a retired elementary counselor who coordinated the placement of the participants and scheduling.

John Baker, (personal communication, September 9, 1996), retired Cedar Falls director of elementary instruction and Dr. George Zucker (personal communication, September, 9, 1996), Professor at University of Northern Iowa who has been responsible for the university's involvement in Cedar Fall's program, reported that the Cedar Falls program, though "loosely knit" is still, at this writing, in existence and thriving. Though Dr. Zucker reports that it has been impossible to replace Eleanor Wilson, the retired elementary counselor/volunteer coordinator who died in 1994, Dr. Zucker is trying to ease the effects of the loss of this valuable person with

a new system this year. The Cedar Fall Public Schools' program, despite its humble roots in terms of financial investment and on-site expertise, was the impetus for expanding FLES to neighboring Waterloo six years ago. Another dimension of expansion: the Cedar Falls program was originally a gifted and talented program, but now university students go into the classroom and all students, with their teacher, are receiving instruction in Spanish language. Even the participating university has been impacted by the Cedar Falls FLES program: a more comprehensive FLES program is now being piloted, in a nearby small town, in conjunction with a FL methodology class at the University of Northern Iowa. In sum, though the Cedar Falls program still has no proficiency goals and still only provides for one class per week for K-6 students, the people involved in the program have proven that a great deal can be done to promote early FL and cultural learning through the hard work of volunteers.

Curtain & Pesola are adamant on the subject of staffing patterns that use non-specialist, volunteer teachers, or cross-age tutors: though such staffing practices:

> proved successful over limited periods of time for some programs with limited goals, such as after-school programs or summer day camps [and] can meet needs of specific programs when programs are carefully planned by language specialists who train and monitor the teachers carefully.... [they are] *not suitable for long-term, articulated FLES programs*. (1994, p. 46)

Most sequential FLES programs, and many FLEX programs use the language specialist staffing model. According to Curtain & Pesola (1994), having one or two FL teachers instruct an entire school, seeing 200-400 students a week, usually by traveling from room to room, is economical and provides for easy articulation between classes and levels. On the other hand, it is a situation in which individualization and teacher attention for each child is limited and teacher burn-out is a risk, particularly if insufficient funding for materials requires teachers to create most of their materials for teaching (Rosenbusch, 1991, Curtain & Pesola, 1994). Also, "the

specialist lacks both the time and the opportunity to relate the language program to the rest of the curriculum or establish ongoing dialogue with all the teachers in all the classes visited during the day or week" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p 40).

Allen (1989) cites John Goodlad's expressed belief that schools need to be creative in their staffing in order to move beyond what they are now. Allen recommends that districts seek to hire classroom teachers with FL fluency, among other specialized backgrounds, as resources to their entire school. FLES programs can be staffed by having qualified elementary classroom teachers with FL proficiency instruct their own class and the classes of team members in FL, in addition to teaching regular elementary subjects in English (Pesola & Curtain, 1989, Curtain & Pesola, 1994). Staffing FLES programs with fluent FL-speaking classroom teachers works best when a language coordinator oversees and assists the teachers (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). It is one way schools can offer FLES without hiring additional staff, which constitutes costliest part of most FLES programs (Lipton, 1992).

Staffing immersion programs is particularly difficult. Qualified individuals are difficult to find because of the high degree of language proficiency and the extensive knowledge of the scope and sequence of the elementary curriculum required to provide instruction of nearly all subjects in the FL (Curtain and Pesola, 1994; Lipton, 1992, Met & Rhodes, 1990). Specialists in art, physical education and music who are also fluent FL speakers are also difficult to locate, so these areas are often taught by classroom immersion teachers or English-speaking specialists. Decisions about whether a different teacher or the immersion teacher will teach English language arts must be based on considerations about (a) individual models for both languages; (b) separation of languages, particularly in order to discourage use of English in the immersion setting; (c) continuity of teaching environment; (d) flexibility of classroom time; and (e)

additional administrative and planning time spent on staffing, scheduling and curriculum coordination (Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

To combat the shortages of native or near-native speakers needed for immersion programs, districts have often looked to the target culture countries for teachers. In Charlotte, North Carolina, the Bruns Avenue Elementary School German immersion program established a partnership with a teachers college in Germany that sends education students to work as teacher assistants. The partnership is also useful because the same college provides materials to the school, which the college uses for research on the program in Charlotte (Wing, 1996).

Immersion teachers or assistants that come from the target culture, though they provide excellent target language models, often have difficulties adjusting to the culture of American elementary schools, not to mention their lack of background in core subjects like American social studies, and lack of familiarity with curricular topics like "community" as we think of them in the US (Wing, 1996).

Two other sequential FLES and FLEX staffing models mentioned by Curtain & Pesola involve extensive use of technology: videotapes or videodisks and interactive television. Both of these solutions require high-quality equipment and, in some cases, software. The success of both depends upon "the quality and intensity of the follow-up..." with a qualified FL teacher (1994, p. 42). Though the authors recognize that video can present some aspects of culture in a unique and exciting way, using video as the mainstay of a FLES program has many limitations. These limitations include total dependence on the classroom teacher's enthusiasm for the course, the ease with which students can tune out video, the high cost of buying, maintaining and upgrading equipment and software and the relative scarcity of high-quality programs on video.

Interactive television can, as Curtain and Pesola report, allow one talented teacher to reach more students than he or she could otherwise, and allow small school districts to combine resources to offer language at the elementary level. The limitations of presenting a FLES course via interactive television are: "it is impossible to engage in as many context-embedded, activity-oriented activities when all the students and the teacher are not physically in the same place" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 43); oral language development and evaluation of progress in oral language are, according to Curtain & Pesola, "severely limited" (1994, p. 43); the teacher involved must be extensively trained in distance learning and the entire production requires careful management; also, students must still be supervised by staff at remote sites, an additional cost of distance learning. Class size for distance learning recommended by the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Language, for students interacting via television is twelve or less.

Qualifications. Met, in an article devoted exclusively to staffing FLES teachers, and aptly named "Walking on Water and other Characteristics of Elementary School Teachers", remarks that "although certain program models may require greater emphasis in some skill/knowledge areas than others, the core areas remain the same" (1989b, p. 177). Met holds that all FLES teachers should possess a historical perspective on FL education, understand rationales for early language education, and be able to effectively communicate the value of the FLES program to non-FL personnel and to defend his or her program if called upon to do so. Knowledge of research about the benefits of early language learning is useful to this end. Also because the FLES teacher often "becomes the program planner, curriculum developer and materials writer" (1989b, p. 177), knowledge in all of these areas is essential. Other areas of skill and knowledge

Met names as crucial are language fluency, target culture and FL methodologies appropriate for young children; understanding of the elementary child and the elementary school; an understanding of second and *first* language development. Met holds that "significant and extensive experience with the elementary school curriculum is essential for all elementary school language teachers, regardless of the grade level or program model in which they teach" (1989b, p. 178).

A partial list of "ESL/FL teacher competencies that reflect the importance of content in language instruction" and thus mark a teacher capable of teaching content-enriched FLES or immersion is offered by Crandall & Willetts (1986, March):

> (a) near-native fluency in language [of] instruction (4 or 5 on the FSI scale or 3 on the...ACTFL scale);
> (b) knowledge of the content areas;
> (c) knowledge of strategies to teach language (according to levels);
> (d) knowledge of strategies to teach content (according to levels);
> (e) ability to use strategies to clarify subject content and contextualize the lesson;
> (f) ability to use the child's first culture to mediate instruction and to bridge gap between first and second culture;
> (g) ability to integrate parents into the learning process
> (h) ability to assess and adapt materials. (1986, p. 7)

Immersion teachers are "over and above the over and above" according to Met. Not only must they possess all of the competencies necessary for FLES teachers, they must also be able to take into account their students' limited language proficiency when planning for instruction in elementary school content areas, sometimes sequencing instruction differently than the standard curriculum to rely on language built from concrete experiences first. Language growth in immersion, insists Met, is not, as many believe, merely a bi-product of content instruction and but must also be planned for. In teaching, immersion teachers must engage in constant negotiation of meaning, concretize concepts constantly and evaluate learning and teaching

strategies to adjust language to this end. Assessment in immersion also requires specialized competencies of immersion teachers with regard to separation of concept mastery from language mastery.

Met (1989b) submits that:

> good elementary school foreign language teaching is simply good teaching. Therefore, it is a given that elementary school foreign language teachers, like all teachers, must demonstrate competencies in the areas of general education, interpersonal skills, and professional education. Such knowledge includes a well-rounded background in the liberal arts and sciences; personal characteristics such as commitment to learning, human development, leadership and communication skills; professional knowledge such as theories of learning, human development, educational psychology, and so on. All good teachers must be able to work effectively with colleagues and students, and know how to involve parents in the learning process. (p. 177)

Training. For programs which have proficiency goals and must rely on teachers who are not adequately trained in all aspects of elementary school curriculum, immersion methodology or of FLES methodology, additional training is a must. Though school districts cannot often determine the programs and course offerings at local universities, there are other sources of training, particularly for existing staff. Writes Met:

> All teachers--regardless of the grade or subject they teach--need opportunities for continued professional growth and renewal. Too often, elementary school FL teachers work in isolation. The relatively small number of teachers in a school district (or even state) may make their needs less obvious to those responsible for staff development. However, the very isolation of such teachers, combined with the probability that their preservice preparation for the elementary school level may not have been extensive, should lead us to insure that the needs of this population are addressed in a concerted and serious manner (1990, p. 436).

Met mentions "summer language institutes for FLES teachers...state workshops and federally funded training efforts, including training at a few universities, school districts, and organizations..." as a few of the sources for FLES teacher inservice training (1990, p. 436). Teacher training is also available in the form of workshop sessions at yearly national

conferences of organizations such as Advocates for Language Learning (ALL), the National Network for Early Language Learning (NNELL) and ACTFL. The challenge for districts, according to Met, is to go beyond the "one-shot, short-term affair" for what usually is a relatively small number of staff (1989b, p. 176).

Districts can also seek funds from state and national governments to help themselves train or retrain their teachers. Ferndale Public Schools and Michigan State University, with the help of a 1989-90 Challenge Grant from the Michigan Department of Education, developed and presented MICHFLES, a statewide training for K-8 FL teachers. MICHFLES was designed particularly for transplanted secondary teachers, to offer them "the knowledge and background information necessary for them to begin a FLES program on a limited scale if their district were planning a program" (Skinner, 1992, p. 4). Over one school year, participants attended workshops by FLES experts, studied theory and publications visited existing programs and examined materials and supplies. Teachers participating reported that the inservice training eased their transition and gave them confidence to teach elementary children FL.

Age-Appropriate, Sound Foreign Language Pedagogy And Materials

Curriculum can be formulated, according to Curtain & Pesola (1988) in three ways: (a) adopting another district's curriculum "as is", if the other district has identical goals, similar populations and existing programs and its program is not outdated; (b) adapting another district's curriculum, changing elements such as scheduling, content, etc.; and (c) writing curriculum, certainly the most demanding in time and talent of the three methods of curriculum formulation. Whatever method is used to develop curriculum, the learning outcomes described in the curriculum must be reached using methodologies and materials that are both age-appropriate and based on research-backed foreign language acquisition theory.

Age-appropriate pedagogy. FLES programs of the 1950s and 60s were developed by FL experts who for the most part were not familiar with the elementary school setting or the elementary school child (Allen, 1989; Curtain & Pesola, 1994). These programs were often delivered by teachers who were accustomed to secondary students and their results were often measured in terms of whether children had mastered sounds and structures, much in the way that high school students were tested for language mastery. Many children repeating audio-lingual method dialogues did not know what they were saying or if they did, understood the phrases to be wooden and artificial. (Spaar, 1968). Pesola & Curtain describe :

> The child learner is not just a learner with less experience and sophistication than the teacher. The child actually reasons differently and experiences the world in a dramatically different way than do adolescents and adults. The teacher who works successfully with children of elementary school age has learned to present the language through concrete objects rather than abstract concepts, to plan active, meaningful experiences and surround them with language. (1989, p. 4)

Elementary age children are not abstract thinkers and therefore FL taught in traditional grammar-based methodologies will confuse and frustrate most elementary-age children. Not only must teachers not teach relying on abstractions, but as Chapman, Grob, and Haas (1989) advise, activities and content for the FLES classroom must also take into account the particular stage of development associated with the age of the learner. They cite characteristics of each age group e.g., four and five year olds can sort, arrange, count to ten but have short attention spans; six year olds will often cheat to win; seven year olds can be overly rigid in rules for games and may have language abilities that belie their conceptual grasp; eight, nine and ten year olds can take past experiences and apply them to new situations, and stereotypes may begin to form in these middle years of childhood; characteristics of which elementary school teachers are well

aware, but that are not so obvious to a transplanted secondary teacher teaching FLES. The same sorts of cognitive, psychological and social distinctions are also true of middle school students.

> As with the study of all of their other subjects, FLES activities must be geared to the young learner's interests, developmental levels, and experiential background.... [They must be] designed to appeal to a variety of learning styles and to incorporate frequent opportunities for movement and physical activity. (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. xiv)

Age-appropriate methods require age-appropriate teaching materials. Cibulsky (1994) gives us five criteria for selecting materials for teaching FL to young children:

> 1. an approach designed to develop communicative competencies (rather than knowledge of specific language structures), with an emphasis on oral (not written) functions in the first stages of instruction;
> 2. an emphasis on physical movement and drama including games, role play, use of puppets, masks, and other props;
> 3. the use of music in various forms (songs, chants, rhymes, instrumental music) as a means of instruction;
> 4. visual materials of a relatively large format that depict subjects recognizable by children; and
> 5. an introduction to the culture of the target language through stories, songs, games, and other traditional activities. (p. 1)

Appropriate materials for FLES were once difficult to locate, and still are to some degree, particularly for immersion (Schinke -Llano, 1985; Lipton, 1992). Sources for FLES materials are: (a) commercial publishers; (b) existing programs that are willing to share or have published materials for purchase; and (c) teacher adapted and created materials (Schinke-Llano, 1985, Lipton, 1994). Appropriate materials for FLES include many non-print items, such as puppets, toys, real objects, and places in the neighborhood (Lipton, 1994). According to Curtain & Pesola language learning at the elementary and middle school "...is organized in terms of concrete experiences; visuals, props, realia, and hands-on activities are integral components of instruction" (1994, p. xiii). Like Cibulsky, Curtain & Pesola also believe that children learn

culture best "through experiences with cultural materials and practices rather than through discussion and reading" (1994, p. xiv).

English grammar is often introduced in English in seventh grade and therefore teachers often introduce some grammar in foreign languages at this age, whether beginning the FL sequence to continue in high school or adding a new dimension to what has been acquired in the elementary grades. Chapman, Grob & Haas (1989) caution the FL teacher to be aware of the wide spread of cognitive development within a group of seventh graders and realize that not all will be able to grasp abstract concepts such as word function. Pesola & Curtain go further, warning:

> No matter how much or how little of the foreign language has been acquired at the elementary school, it is most appropriate to plan a middle or junior high program focused on communication in the target language rather than on grammar and syntax. Because so many middle-school children are still concrete thinkers, or in early stages of formal operations, these may be the worst possible years in which to deal with the abstractions of grammar for the first time. (1989, p. 10)

Pesola & Curtain caution teachers not to squelch the enthusiasm for FL gained in elementary school by introducing non-communicative approaches at this stage.

Sound foreign language pedagogy. Not only must elementary FL pedagogy be age-appropriate, it must also be sound FL pedagogy, pedagogy that is based upon what we, as FL educators, know about second language acquisition. Krashen (1981, 1982, 1983) writes that if the goal is communicative competence, second language *acquisition*, which resembles the unconscious process in which a child learns a first language, is preferable to second language *learning*, which is a conscious process of learning about language. "Learning, conscious knowledge, serves only as an editor, or Monitor. We appeal to learning to make corrections, to change the output of the acquired system before we speak or write (or sometimes after we speak

or write, as in self-correction)"(1982, pp. 1-2). The Monitor, according to Krashen, rather than aiding in communication, often impedes it.

In order to acquire language, comprehensible input must be offered by the "caretaker" or teacher, who must include extra-linguistic support, such as "limiting speech to the child to the 'here and now'...provid[ing] context via visual aids...and discussion of familiar topics" (1982, p. 2). Krashen's Input Hypothesis states that acquisition of language occurs when, to comprehensible input are added, "structures that are a bit beyond [the acquirer's] current level of competence" (1982, p. 2). The Input Hypothesis informs almost every current second language method and underpins most literature that deals with methodology. There are two corollaries to Krashen's input hypothesis, both of which have implications for FLES methodology:

> (a) Speaking is a result of acquisition and not its cause. Speech cannot be taught directly but "emerges" on its own as a result of building competence via comprehensible input.
> (b) If input is understood, and there is enough of it, the necessary grammar is automatically provided. The language teacher need not attempt deliberately to teach the next structure along the natural order [in which we acquire the rules of language]--it will be provided in just the right quantities and automatically reviewed if the student receives a sufficient amount of comprehensible input. (Krashen, 1982, p. 2)

The first corollary of Krashen's Input Hypothesis is almost certainly behind Pesola & Curtain's (1989) recommendation that early language experiences activities that focus upon listening rather than speaking. Emphasizing comprehension rather than speaking "shadow[s] the process of first-language acquisition" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. xiii). Schinke-Llano (1985) cites research that a "silent period" is desirable, if not necessary, in the beginning stages of first and second language acquisition. She points to Asher's Total Physical Response (TPR) method as an example of a successful method that provides for a silent period.

Schinke-Llano (1985) outlines the environment necessary for second language acquisition in the elementary school. To do so, she combines Krashen's theory with those of Long (1983) and Cummins (1980). In keeping with Krashen's theory, such an environment (a) provides sufficient amounts of grammatically unsequenced, comprehensible input in a setting that does not cultivate the Monitor and allows for a silent period; it provides Long's prerequisite, (b) "negotiated interaction", or verbal interaction with native speakers that affords opportunity for input; and (c) it allows development in both kinds of language skills that, according to Cummins, are to be gained in formal settings like a classroom: basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), or language skills for everyday conversations, and cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP), or language skills that are specifically needed to perform effectively in an academic environment. Although, of all program types, immersion's environment is the only one that meets all of her composite criteria, Schinke-Llano adds that "both FLEX and FLES programs can provide material that is interesting, relevant, comprehensible, and not grammatically sequenced; their shortcoming is the requirement of sufficient quantity will most likely not be met" (p. 15). It is certainly in part to increase the quantity of comprehensible input that Curtain & Pesola (1994) recommend that the FLES instruction be "consistently conducted in the target language with minimal use of the native language" (p. xiii).

FLES and FLEX can profit in terms of richness of language to which children are exposed and eventually have the opportunity to learn by adapting many strategies and philosophies from immersion. The characteristics of successful immersion programs which have applications in FLES and, to a smaller extent, FLEX named by Curtain and Pesola are:

1. Communication motivates all language use....
2. There is natural use of oral language....

3. Language is a tool of instruction, and not just the object of instruction....
4. Subject content is taught in the target language....
5. Grammar instruction does not follow any set sequence, or may be dictated by communication needs....
6. Error correction is minimal and focuses on errors of meaning rather than on errors of form....
7. Use of the native language is kept clearly separated from use of the target language....
8. Reading and writing experiences accompany the development of oral language...
9. Literacy skills are transferred from the language in which they first are learned to the next language. In early total immersion programs, students learn to read first in the target language....
10. Culture is an integral component of language learning....
11. The second-language atmosphere permeates the classroom and the school. (1994, pp. 83-89)

Grammar, according to Curtain & Pesola should not be taught overtly and should not be the object of instruction (1994). Instead, if Krashen's second corollary to the Input Hypothesis is borne out, grammar will be learned the same way in which it is learned in first language acquisition. Teachers must provide opportunities for genuine, meaningful communication in which information is received or given, in contexts that have significance for the student, avoiding contrived language designed to incorporate recently learned grammar structures (Pesola & Curtain, 1989; Curtain & Pesola, 1994). "Learning can actually be inhibited by efforts to simplify input or to present information in a carefully sequenced, prepatterned manner" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 58). Teacher correction of student errors, as well, should focus on meaning and not on grammar accuracy. Students need the opportunity for "comprehensible output" as much as input: they need their attempts at communication to be valued and not constantly interrupted with grammar corrections (Swain, 1985; Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

Content-Based Instruction as the Foundation for Relevance to and Inclusion in the Overall School Program

"A key factor is that if a FLES* program is to be successful, *it must be a significant part of the total school educational program*" (Lipton, 1992, p. 25). Met and Rhodes, in their "Priorities for the 1990s" article, state: "Whether developing linguistic or cultural skills, programs need to develop curricula which integrate the foreign language with other aspects of the elementary school program" (1990, p. 437). Met gives a definition of content-based instruction, which is a basis for satisfying these imperatives:

> Content-based foreign language instruction uses learning objectives and activities drawn from the elementary school curriculum as a vehicle for teaching foreign language skills. The foreign language may be the sole vehicle for teaching the content, substituting for the native language instruction; or, instruction through the foreign language may augment and supplement content instruction in the native language. (1989, p. 43)

Content-based FL instruction is recognized widely for two strengths it brings to the FLES program: (a) it integrates FL into the elementary curriculum and into the elementary school day, fostering cooperation between classroom teachers and FL teachers, and preventing many complaints that their are just not enough hours in the school day for FL (Lipton, 1990; Met, 1989, Curtain & Pesola, 1994); and (b) it provides a context for sound language and content pedagogy, in that it emphasizes meaningful and purposeful communication (Curtain & Pesola 1994). Content-based learning also provides the linguistic foundation necessary for learning richer language and performing more cognitively demanding, content-related language tasks (Snow, Met and Genesee, 1989; Met, 1989; Curtain & Pesola, 1994).

The K-4 benchmarks proposed in the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages' National Standards, include two benchmarks involving content-based or content-related teaching:

> (a) Students will participate in an activity in the foreign language class based on a particular concept from one of their other classes (Goal 3, Standard 3.2).

> (b) Students will learn vocabulary or concepts related to a topic being studied in another class (e.g., geographical place names, parts of the body, basic mathematical manipulations; Goal 3, Standard 3.2). (Rosenbusch, 1995, p. 11)

In a report on elementary FL teachers' critique of the proposed standards, most teachers surveyed generally agreed the two content-related language learning benchmarks were feasible: they were either "already implemented" or "feasible, though not currently met" in their programs (Rosenbusch, 1995, p. 11).

Integration. Curtain & Haas (1995, April) cite Genesee's (1994) assertion that traditional FL methods disassociate language learning not only from students' cognitive, academic, and social development, but also from the rest of their school day. As Müller (1989) points out, "unlike the situation in secondary and postsecondary institutions, it is not the disciplines that drive instruction at the elementary level" (p. viii). Rather than establishing a discipline-driven FLES program in which the children, their classroom teacher and the FLES teacher see the FL as a subject outside of their regular studies, content-based instruction makes FL "an integral part of the entire school program"(Curtain & Haas, 1995).

Müller describes the how it is possible to learn content in the elementary curriculum in a FL:

> Even when exploring mathematical relationships with concrete objects [children] verbalize their experience, trying to explain the conclusions they reach and asking for more information. Concrete experience and verbal concepts are often acquired simultaneously. These learning experiences need not be in their native language. Because elementary school learning is less compartmentalized by discipline, the subject matter introduced in a foreign language need not be restricted to language itself or the peoples who speak it. (1989, p. x)

For every basic FLES program model, researchers indicate ways in which content-based instruction may improve FLES program viability by ensuring that FLES is considered a part of the larger elementary program. In a FLEX setting, Allen envisions how FLEX's emphasis on

culture can allow both language teacher and classroom teacher to integrate a class' in depth study of a land and people with study of the FL. In FLES, many of the activities appropriate to the social studies and math curricula may be conducted entirely in the foreign language (Snow, Met & Genesee, 1989). As for immersion, immersion *is* content-based FL instruction. Because immersion is most often taught in immersion schools, or in a school within a school setting, integration into the total school program is not an issue.

The integration of FL into the elementary curriculum will require a reconceptualization of the roles of language teachers and content-area teachers, according to Snow, Met & Genesee (1989) where an extensive amount of teamwork is required of both.

> The artificial and rigid distinctions between the roles of the language teacher and the content teacher are broken down in this model. For sheltered English and immersion teachers these roles are fused, requiring them to plan consciously for language growth as an integral part of content instruction.
>
> A corollary implication of this perspective concerns the formal integration and coordination of the language arts and academic curricula. Accordingly, the content-areas of the school program are cross-referenced with language-learning objectives, and the second/foreign language curriculum is cross referenced with subject areas that provide particularly suitable vehicles for teaching language objectives. (p. 214)

Content-based FL learning can also be the stimulus for getting non-FL teachers to think about the possibilities of FL on a district level. In Kansas City, Missouri Public Schools, which has magnet elementary and middle immersion schools that feed into two magnet high schools, the gains of teaching languages via content have been convincing enough that "the district hopes to have core subjects taught in target languages in the entire K-12 program" (Spinelli, p. 65, 1996).

Although content-based instruction can improve the image of FLES and warm the regards of non-FL speaking staff, there is reason to proceed carefully: Lipton (1990) cautions

program designers not to push FL teachers who are not familiar with current methodologies in math, science and other content areas to teach in these areas, both because these teachers may not feel comfortable teaching in these areas and because others may accuse them of teaching in an area outside of their expertise.

Pedagogy. Content-based instruction parallels natural language acquisition because in both settings, "children acquire language and information about the world simultaneously" (Met, 1989, p. 45). Children's natural curiosity and the information gap inherent in a lesson provides intrinsic motivation to learn both language and content.

Many ideas and practices from immersion and English as a Second Language are applied in FLES and FLEX, particularly in the area of content-based instruction. In studying English language development in language minority students, Cummins (1981) describes a paradigm in which all language tasks can be described as either *context reduced* or *context embedded*. Context-reduced tasks are more language dependent and thus make meaning less accessible to second language learners. Context-embedded and context reduced tasks are each in turn either cognitively demanding or undemanding. It is now a fairly common practice to design context-embedded tasks and environments whenever possible to promote language learning, whether for a first or second language. Applying Cummins' paradigm to FLES, Snow, Met & Genesee (1989) warn that in providing an abundance of contextual cues and supports for second language learners, teachers may sometimes limit their students to cognitively undemanding tasks, would be the case, for example, if teachers set objectives for upper elementary students to identify colors and numbers. Instead of relying solely on context-embedded, undemanding tasks to convey meaning and stopping there, Curtain & Pesola (1994) recommend that second language

teachers extend lessons to include tasks and activities that are both context-embedded and cognitively demanding. Curtain & Pesola give examples of how cognitively demanding tasks that are potentially also context-reduced, like a math story problem, can be rendered context-embedded when supported by visuals or graphic representation. "With the addition of context, materials that would otherwise be unintelligible in the target language can contribute to student learning" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 154).

In content-based language learning, Snow, Met and Genesee discern two types of language-learning objectives, *content-obligatory* and *content-compatible*, that are derived from three sources: "a) the second/foreign language curriculum, b) the content-area curriculum; and c) assessment of the learner's academic and communicative needs and ongoing evaluation of their developing language skills" (1989, p. 205). The authors suggest that language teachers and content-area teachers "pool their respective expertise" to assess what structures, functions and vocabulary is necessary, or content-obligatory, in order for students to learn specified content-area objectives. Meanwhile, content-compatible language-learning objectives for the same lesson arise from the second/foreign language curriculum.

Met (1989) so believes in the validity of content-based instruction as a means for language acquisition that, for remediation of the language deficiencies researchers have found among immersion graduates, she prefers additional content-based instruction over grammar lessons. This type of remediation is possible by performing finely tuned error analysis and then creating new content-compatible language objectives which zero in on those language deficiencies.

Allen (1989) sees parallels between learning in a whole language setting and second language acquisition in immersion classes. Like whole language learning, in which "authentic experiences provide real reasons to question, explain, record and describe", the immersion classroom:

> (a) develops an environment that will help children draw meaning from the context in which they are working; (b) shapes classroom activities so that they provide not only a spectrum of language opportunities but also nudge children to use language in a variety of ways; (c) provides an input of predictable and repetitive language on which children can draw; (d) creates opportunities that allow children to practice language in purposeful ways. (1989, pp. 19-20)

Curtain & Pesola's recommendation that planning in K-8 FL programs be "organized around a thematic center...[establishing] a balance among the basic goals of culture, subject content, and language in use" (1994, p. xiv) is also reminiscent of whole language philosophy.

Curtain and Pesola (1994) distinguish content-based instruction and content-related instruction. In the former, the FL teacher takes responsibility for teaching a portion of the grade-level curriculum in the FL; in the latter, concepts from the curriculum are taught to enrich the FL experience, but are not necessarily at the grade level of the students being taught.

Articulation with Middle and Secondary School Programs

Articulation has long been a problem and a challenge, not only for elementary school FL programs, but for FL education as a whole (Jackson, 1996). Ask any student who has transferred from one secondary program to another: French III in district A does not necessarily equal French III in district B, unless perhaps both districts use the same textbooks in nearly the same way. Wilson (1988, November) recommends that FLES teachers within a district "address the same objectives at each course level, while utilizing similar strategies and instructional materials" (p. 1).A lack of this type of *horizontal articulation* can exist within schools with

FLES programs when more than one school in a district feeds into another school and new students have not had similar FLES experiences. Multi-age entrances into programs also make for challenges in horizontal articulation. To illustrate the complexity of problems multi-age entrances into FLES programs can pose, Schinke-Llano asks: "Are materials that are suitable for a second-grader in his or her second year of German study ...equally suitable for a sixth grader in the second year of study?" (1985, p. 45).

Another example of horizontal articulation concerns: FLES programs everywhere must consider how to acclimate new students in the school who have never studied FL. In Ferndale, Michigan's sequential FLES program, new students are lent audio tapes and accompanying books on a library system. These tapes cover prerequisite vocabulary, classroom expressions and structures. Rosenbusch (1991) reports that some districts offer tutoring for new students and some do not grade them until they are caught up to grade level. Immersion programs, she notes, do not often allow new students to enter the program after grade 1, and then only after they are carefully screened, "in order to minimize disruptions to the ongoing program" (p. 305), though there are some immersion programs that will allow students to enter at any grade.

When researchers like Lipton, Heining-Boyton, and Rosenbusch name lack of articulation as one of the reasons for FLES program failure, they are referring primarily to a lack of *vertical articulation*. Vertical articulation is coordination that makes possible the type of ideal that Munks envisions: "Introducing foreign language in the elementary schools, continuing through the secondary level, and culminating with a seamless hand-off into colleges and universities..." (1989, pp. 10-11). For districts that have elementary programs and even for districts that begin FL study in the middle school, courses at comparatively higher levels FL programs often fail to provide for the input needs of students, imput that would allow students to

move from one level of language acquisition to the next. A failure in vertical articulation most often occurs when students move from one level of school to another within a system, from elementary to middle school or from middle school to high school. The same kind of problem has also troubled students in their transition from K-12 to college or university FL study (Jackson, 1996).

"No FLES program should be started without consideration of the options open to those students who want to continue at the secondary level" (Wilson, November, 1988, p. 2). In the worst cases in the 1960s, FLES students repeated the same vocabulary year after year and often the graduating FLES student was forced to repeat much of what he or she had learned in middle school or high school FL classes. Curtain & Pesola suggest a "'bridge course' for students who do not fit in an expected level" and insist: "never place students who already know some language in the same class as real beginner" (1994, p. 274). Met postulates: "the greater the proficiency gained through a FLES program the more difficult it will be for students to be content in a first year language program at the junior high school" (1985, p. 471). She cautions:

> If planning for the junior and senior high school level is not an integral part of planning for the elementary level, the lack of articulation will eventually backfire: parents will become dissatisfied with the kinds of experiences offered at the junior and senior high schools, disillusioned with the opportunities for students to continue their skills. (1985, p. 471)

In the last published national survey of elementary FL programs, in 1988, Rhodes and Oxford found that only 31% of the 1,416 responding elementary schools had made provisions for children who had studied a FL in the elementary school to continue studying at their level of achievement at the middle school and high school levels (p. 56). In 49% of the programs, graduating FLES students could enroll in more advanced courses than the beginning level, but FLES students' level of achievement in the FL was not necessarily considered as a prerequisite

to entering a given level in middle school or high school, nor were the high school or middle school courses necessarily designed to accommodate students with the type of FL background that those who exit FLES programs possess. In some cases there was a gap between elementary and high school when no FL instruction was available. (Rhodes & Oxford, 1988, p. 55).

Met (1985) reports:

> In some FLES programs the emphasis is on vocabulary development and not on structures. And, since junior and senior high school programs tend to be based on mastery of a hierarchy of grammatical structures, a FLES program can articulate well with a secondary program. (p. 471)

In a more recent article, Met sees the same combination of an elementary school emphasis on vocabulary and aural/oral skills and secondary emphasis on grammar and reading and writing skills "a serious mismatch" (1990, p. 441), because, regardless of the change in curricular emphasis, students ended up repeating so much of what they had learned in elementary school FL programs. In the 1990 article, she insists that students exiting FLES programs and students new to the language must be grouped separately in high school, because "mixing them is unfair to students and teachers alike" (p. 441).

For districts starting programs, some FLES educators recommend that if a district can only start with a limited number of years of elementary study, that FLES be added to the grade levels immediately preceding the grade level at which existing programs begin, e.g., if two years of FLES are to be added in a district that has already established a grade 6-8 middle school FL program, that the FLES program begin in grade 4, so the FLES program can be articulated with the existing program ("NNELL networking", 1993-94). Rosenbusch (1991) believes that expanding downward, though "more cautious and thus more politically expedient" (p. 304) has a considerable disadvantage because "every year the curriculum is expanded, all of the newly

prepared curriculum levels need to be rewritten to prepare for the different ages and developmental levels of the students...resulting in tremendous cost and effort spent on curriculum development" (p. 304). She also points out that it's easier for administration to cut a program before it has fully expanded downward and that its more tempting, with older elementary students, to make the curriculum a mere "watered-down" version of traditional, grammar-based programs offered at the secondary level. Expanding programs upward requires, according to Rosenbusch, "a strong commitment to the foreign language program, and an assurance of continued funding" (p. 304) because a gap will be left if the program expansion is not carried out. It is also possible to expand at more than one level at a time for districts who wish to give all students currently in elementary school the opportunity to study a FL. Rosenbusch believes that, with planning and a timeline, successful articulation is possible expanding in either direction, upward in grade levels, downward, or even both at the same time.

There are situations, usually involving FLEX program graduates, in which articulation with foreign language programs in the middle school or high school requires no consideration at all: "In some cases, a language program continues over a number of years, but at such a low level of frequency and intensity that little or no language proficiency develops for most students (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 35).

Schinke-Llano recommends that "The entire sequence of foreign language offerings in grades K-12 ...be reviewed when an administration plans to introduce an early foreign language program" (1985, p. 38). Rosenbusch stresses that it crucial in planning for FLES that schools budget not only for curriculum development in the elementary FL program, but that they also budget for revision of existing secondary programs to accommodate new graduates. In Arlington (Virginia) Public Schools, it was in large part an articulation problem that prompted curriculum

redevelopment in K-12 FL instruction, beginning in the 1992-93 school year. The Arlington Curriculum Development Model adopts a "teacher-centered" curriculum development process to increase communication between teachers and "increase the chances for agreement between stated policies and goals of the foreign language curriculum, on one hand, and their actual implementation in classrooms, on the other" (Connor-Linton, 1996, pp. 140-141).

In Arlington, the same beginning level of FL was offered at both the middle school and the high school levels. This caused a problem in articulation because students entering the ninth grade, after two years of middle school FL study, were "electing or being counseled to repeat level III (which they had just completed in eighth grade)...[and] many students perceived that their middle school FL courses had not prepared them for the next level of (high school) FL instruction" (Connor-Linton, 1996, pp. 139-140). Articulation in districts, like Arlington, that begin a FL program at a number of different grade levels at the same time can be difficult and are not uncommon at the juncture between middle and high school, and between elementary and middle school.

To prevent the lack of continuity that can result from FL instruction being offered to children of different ages, in different schools and initiating study of a particular language at different points in K-12 years, the Arlington Model recommends a five-stage curriculum development process that brings all district FL teachers together in working groups which are differently composed for each stage of the process. Once program philosophy, mission, and goals have been generated (Stage 1), teachers of mixed levels identify curriculum components (Stage 2). The third and fourth stages of curriculum development are particularly important to ensuring smooth articulation. Stage 3, "Elaborating Curriculum Components", has teachers from the *same level*, regardless of the age of students they teach, work together to "flesh out" each

level of instruction, providing information about curriculum components to be put into draft form by a steering committee. Stage 4, Amending the "Curriculum for Interlevel Articulation", has *mixed-level* groups assess:

> the multi-level, elaborated curriculum draft for articulation between levels of instruction, looking at each curriculum component *across* all levels and answering two sets of questions:
>
> 1) Which elements of each curriculum component will be taught by more than one level of instruction?...Where more than one level of instruction will teach an element of the curriculum, how is that element taught/learned differently at different levels (e.g., by level of proficiency demanded, by complexity of communicative function or grammar taught, by domain or register of vocabulary taught, etc.)?
>
> 2) The curriculum for each level of instruction describes that level's outcomes or exit goals. Does the teaching/learning described at each lower level of instruction provide the necessary foundation for each curricular element (e.g., communicative functions, teaching activities, language forms, etc.) listed at each higher level? If not, what must be added to the curriculum--[and] at what level(s)--to prepare learners for the demands of each level of instruction? (Connor-Linton, 1996, p. 145)

Grouping teachers from mixed levels of instruction, in Stage 4, to work out interlevel articulation "forces them to negotiate solutions to the articulation problems they identify [and] ensures that not every articulation problem is 'solved' by adding new teaching/learning demands upon the next lower level of instruction" (Connor-Linton, 1996, pp. 145-146). In stage 5, teachers of the same level, again, regardless of the age of their students, work together to create as many "'Component Cluster' Instructional Units" as time permits, integrating curriculum components (Connor-Linton, 1996, p. 146).

Elementary immersion programs are particularly tricky to articulate with existing middle and high school language programs. Rhodes, Tucker & Clark (1981) believe elementary immersion program graduates have "*at least* one course each year in junior and senior year taught *in* the foreign language" (1981, p. 40).

Well-articulated programs do exist: Wing (1996) describes the articulation of the 4J public school district in Eugene, Oregon. The elementary partial immersion program offered at 3 magnet schools feeds into three middle schools that each offer continuing immersion in one of three languages: Spanish, French and Japanese. Graduates of the middle school program may continue partial immersion studies at district's international high school, where they may also prepare for the International Baccalaureate. Rhodes names the Glastonbury, Connecticut K-12 FL program as an example of a well-articulated program sequential FLES program(personal communication, August, 13, 1996).

Oller attributes articulation problems between elementary and middle or high school programs to inadequate means for testing students: "Articulation between levels requires evaluation to assure continuity and to enable educators to direct streams of incoming students into appropriate classes" (1989, p. 100).

Similarly, Jackson (1996) and the participants in the Articulation and Achievement Project, on which she reports, see the articulation difficulties as arising from the challenge "to find reasonable and practical ways to describe student competence without reference to the traditional criteria of years of study and/or lists of grammatical concepts covered" (p. 130). Building upon ACTFL's work on the Oral Proficiency Test, the participants in the Articulation and Achievement Project outlined a series of five stages along which learners can be seen to progress. These stages are described in terms of functions, context, content, text type and accuracy.

Perhaps, as Jackson suggests, the development of national standards will ultimately resolve some of the more general articulation problems in FL education and among them will be

the unique articulation problems elementary school FL programs pose. Jackson writes that the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, developed in response to Goals 2000,:

> have the potential to resolve some of the dilemmas of articulation because of the process that was developed to create them and the product that resulted from that process. The [Standards] project has demonstrated that various constituencies can collaborate and create a meaningful plan for the improvement of foreign language instruction for all students, beginning in the early elementary years and continuing through graduation from high school. Building the bridges that will realize the promise of The Standards is now the responsibility of the profession nationwide. Researchers and practitioners must continue developing content-based, culturally-aware curricula. Planning time, flexible scheduling, adequate staffing, and financial and material resources will be needed. We will have to address the issues of meeting the needs of all students, easing transitions from level to level and school to school and, most important implementing the Standards as much as possible throughout the country. (Jackson, 1996, p. 125)

Frequent Student Assessment and Periodic Program Evaluation

Both assessment of student progress in reaching expected outcomes and evaluation of the FLES program's success in meeting its goals and objectives are necessary if FLES programs are to survive budget crunches and back-to-basics initiatives. Says Heining-Boyton: "...the intelligent FLES educator and advocate understands that tomorrow's legislator may not be as supportive [as today's]. As funding comes and goes, the enduring curriculum is the one that substantiates its effectiveness. The way to document program accomplishments is through evaluation" (1991, p. 66). Lipton echoes Heining-Boyton's counsel: "'This type of program has been evaluated elsewhere' will not suffice. Taxpayers want to know what they are getting for their tax dollars in their own communities! Programs which have existed for many years without benefit of evaluation and scrutiny will be subject to the tax-cutter's ax" (1991, p. 1085).

Student assessment. According to Curtain & Pesola, assessment of learning that is "frequent, regular, and ongoing in a manner that is consistent with program goals and teaching

strategies" is one of the key concepts to success in language learning for children at the elementary and middle school level (1994, p. xiv).

Oller recognized the importance for better testing of elementary school FL students:

> When compared with other 'basic skill' areas of the curriculum, e.g., math, reading, primary language skills, which are commonly evaluated by some kind of systematic testing, we get the strong impression that FLES programs suffer in a variety of ways as a direct or indirect result of inadequate testing and evaluation. (1989, p. 100)

Oller notes the distinction between proficiency-based and achievement-based descriptions of language ability, as described in ACTFL's Japanese Proficiency Guidelines: "Whereas proficiency is conceived but in general, abstract, and perhaps universal terms, achievement is construed to apply to particular and concrete objectives, methods, activities, and even certain textual items, vocabulary items, and structures" (1989, p. 113). Language proficiency must not be tested using traditional grammar-based instruments that test language achievement and not proficiency (Pesola and Curtain, 1989), nor must FLES programs use standardized secondary examinations to evaluate their students' progress (Lipton, 1992; Thompson, 1995).

Evaluation of student progress in language proficiency and measuring gains students have made in other areas that FL study is supposed to teach, e.g., cultural understanding, communication skills, etc., brings to the fore issues that have presented problems for our profession for decades: the existence, or non-existence, of universally accepted content standards, performance standards and a common language for talking about proficiency. As standards and proficiency levels are explored by researchers and professional organizations and solutions are adopted by professional organizations and their members, the answers to many

questions about what is reasonable for students to learn over a given number of hours, and how to articulate between levels will become much easier to determine.

As a profession, FL educators are coming closer to adopting a common language to describe language ability, particularly for use in summative assessments demonstrating that students are gaining FL proficiency by their study of FL. In the past, the difficulty was knowing what any given evaluator, including in self-evaluation, meant by "fluent", "minimally fluent", etc. The United States government recognized the need for universally recognized descriptors for FL ability and so, in the 1970s, created the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) to "develop an oral proficiency interview to screen candidates for foreign service and other government positions that required a high degree of language fluency" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 23). Using the experience and some of the frameworks and descriptors of the ILR scale, ACTFL adapted the ILR scale to the describe in more detail the lower levels of proficiency expected in secondary school and college settings to create the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*. Published in 1986, the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* gave the profession specific level names, e.g., native, superior, advanced plus, intermediate-high, novice-mid, to denote corresponding oral, written, listening and reading tasks a speaker can perform with respect to function, context and accuracy. Though few districts currently perform ACTFL's proficiency interviews, the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* inform many published secondary language courses. According to Curtain & Pesola:

> Most elementary school foreign language teachers find the ACTFL guidelines in their present form are difficult to apply directly to the curriculum of the elementary school program. Many of the functions and much of the content described are not closely related to the interests and needs of children. (1994, p. 23)

The *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* "provide a common metric against which to measure performance in speaking, reading and writing in a second language" (*Standards*, 1996, p. 13), and are some help for elementary FL teachers in describing levels of proficiency of their students or graduates. The *Guidelines* do not, however, designate content or performance standards. ACTFL began to develop student performance standards in 1992, "in response to the school reform movement and the standards program of the National Assessment of Education Progress" (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 23). The performance standards include an "early start/extended sequence", described as "the equivalent of 30 minutes per day in grades 3-6, a full 50 minutes in grades 7-8, and 50 minutes per day in grades 9-12 in one language" ("Standards proposed", 1992-93, p. 8). Outcomes for grade four are for after 180 hours of study, and outcomes for grade 8 are for after 660 total hours of study, of which 480 hours in grades 5-8.

When foreign languages were finally named one of the core subjects to be include in *Goals 2000*, ACTFL developed content standards, as did peers in other disciplines. These standards, set forth in the document, *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*, identify "what students should be able to do...in grades four, eight, and twelve" (*Standards*, 1996, p. 13).

The content standards in *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century* will probably affect FL assessment nation-wide inasmuch as they will affect FL curriculum. Curriculum, in an indirect way, affects assessment: "assessment and curriculum must be linked. Any assessment instrument should be directly tied to and sequenced with the curriculum, instructional goals, and program that it supports. No instrument exists outside of the context for which it was created" (Thompson, 1995, xii). Districts adopting curricula based on the content standards for FL developed for *Goals 2000* will therefore need to consider the

Standards when developing assessment tools. This notwithstanding the *Standards* document presents no performance standards, nor does it prescribe any assessment instruments, leaving that responsibility to states and local school districts. The authors of the *Standards* point out that work done in the past to develop the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* "have placed FL educators in an excellent position to develop new kinds of performance-based assessments that reflect the content standards in [the *Standards*]" (*Standards*, p. 13). The "sample progress indicators" for grades four, eight and twelve provided in the Standards go a long way in giving direction for performance standards to be adopted in the future by states and local districts. "Particularly for ...extended sequences of study..., it will be important that schools set exit standards for communication that reflect the additional time available" (*Standards*, 1996, p. 14).

The *Standards*, it is worth noting, provide content standards and sample progress indicators for FL content other than language proficiency per se, such as "appreciation for other cultures", that frequently have been left unassessed. Learning of this "other" content must be assessed if FLES programs with stated goals to teach it are to rationalize their very existence.

The National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center, a collaboration among Iowa State University, the Center for Applied Linguistics and foreign language educators and researchers around the country, has sponsored the K-8 Foreign Language Bibliography Project. One resulting document is *K-8 Foreign Language Assessment: A Bibliography*. The bibliography identifies and describes K-8 proficiency assessment instruments collected from FLES educators, from schools, school districts, state education offices, and educational research organizations, as well as selected commercially available language tests, for many languages and program models, with the notable exclusion of FLEX.

Lynn Thompson, the compiler of the K-8 assessment bibliography, encourages educators to share in and take advantage of work done in the area of assessment by colleagues around the country, by using the bibliography to identify appropriate assessment instruments. Thompson reminds us of the limitations of adopting instruments developed for other programs:

> Even when you have identified an assessment instrument that seems appropriate for your program, certain content changes will probably be necessary due to the unique features that distinguish each class, school district, and state. Thus, in all likelihood, 'adaptation' rather than 'adoption' of a particular instrument will be the key word. (1995, xii)

Thompson does not see the dichotomy of assessment in terms of measuring mastery of grammatical structures versus ability to express linguistic functions. Instead, her traditional versus alternative assessment resembles the distinction being made in the broader educational profession. Traditional assessment it characterized by instruments that measure discrete points, for which students are assigned scores based on percentages, tests that are easily and quickly scored, as in a multiple choice format, and passive recognition sufficing for the student to find the correct answer. When they are standardized, traditional assessment instruments "allow comparisons across populations [and] are considered statistically valid and reliable" (1995, p. xvi).

In alternative assessment, on the other hand:

> (a) emphasis is on the process of learning rather than the product;
> (b) assessment tasks involve the application and integration of instructional content;
> (c) tasks are often open-ended, offer students a great degree of choice and input, and culminate in individual and group performances;
> (d) language is assessed holistically. Scoring requires judgment and use of scoring criteria (e.g., rubrics);
> (e) assessments often involve multi-step production tasks or multiple observations and thus require extended time to complete;
> (f) tasks require students to demonstrate knowledge actively through problem-solving, inferencing, and other complex cognitive skills;
> (g) tasks are situation-based or based in the real-world context;

(h) assessments often have not been evaluated for statistical validity or reliability.(1995, p. xvi)

Traditional assessment is used to assess learning outcomes; in contrast, alternative assessment assesses "learning processes...instructional processes...instructional objectives [and encourages] student involvement and ownership of assessment and learning [and] collaboration between students and teachers", in addition to assessing learning (Thompson, 1995, p. xvi). Thompson also sees how alternative assessment can be used to plan effective instruction.

Instead of tests, alternative assessment uses portfolios, journals, demonstrations, conferences, and observations and "call for more student involvement in planning assessment, interpreting the results of assessment, and in self assessment' (Thompson, 1995, pp. xv- xvi).

Program evaluation. "If FLES programs [that flourished in the 1950s] had been periodically evaluated, perhaps weaknesses could have been diagnosed and corrected" (Heining-Boyton, 1991, p. 64). Program implementation should provide for program evaluation for the following purposes: "to determine the degree of success of a program... [and] to identify factors contributing or impeding that success" (Schinke-Llano, 1985, p. 47). Lipton stresses that program planners must consider a design for evaluation, including who will conduct the evaluation, during the planning and organizing stages of the program (1992, p. 188). The link between program goals and program evaluation is direct. Schinke-Llano uses Bissel's question to define program evaluation in its simplest version: "Have the stated program objectives been met?" (1985, p. 47). Though student performance, as determined by standardized tests, has traditionally been the indicator of the success or failure of educational programs and practices, FLES program goals and objectives often include content other than language proficiency. Heining-Boyton reminds us that success in meeting objectives for programs cannot be measured

simply in terms of test scores: "Its 'merit or worth' also hinges on the observations, judgments, opinions, and impressions of participants and members of the community" (1991, p. 64).

As to who should conduct the evaluation, Lipton, Schinke-Llano and others mention the following possibilities: (a) one ore more persons within the district or program; (b) outside consultants specializing either in research or FLES; (c) the FLES advisory or planning committee itself; (d) the district evaluator; and (e) self evaluation. Heining-Boyton found in her 1988 survey of Michigan FLES programs that program evaluations were most frequently carried out by building principals. Oller notes that school principals "are only rarely specialists in languages and would not usually refer to specific test data on children in FLES programs, [therefore] one cannot know the basis of their evaluation" (1989, p. 100). Schinke-Llano points out that there are advantages and disadvantages to recommended evaluators:

> While outside evaluators, for example, require a consulting fee that district-related personnel do not, they are generally regarded as more objective than their district-based colleagues. On the other hand, the very distance from the program that supposedly ensures the outside evaluator's objectivity may also result in a misunderstanding of the district and its goals for students in the foreign language program. (1985, p. 50)

Schinke-Llano's next step, after determining who should conduct the program evaluation, is to determine the purpose of the evaluation. Heining-Boyton divides rationales for program evaluation into "two broad categories: feedback and accountability" (1991, p. 66). Once the purposes have been determined, data-gathering instruments must be selected or developed (Schinke-Llano, 1985). Both Schinke-Llano and Heining-Boyton see student assessment and questionnaires or surveys of teachers, parents and students as likely components of program evaluation. Schinke-Llano envisions evaluators using program records, for reasons such as determining the amount of teacher training provided and the teachers in attendance at training, if teacher training is part of the stated goals and objectives of the FLES program.

Schinke-Llano then recommends a timeline for the program evaluation be determined, followed by administration of assessment instruments. Decisions regarding the "Who?, What?, How?, Where?, and When?" of administration must also be made (1985, p. 52).

Schinke-Llano's next step in program evaluation is analysis and interpretation of results. Comparisons to previous test results or pretests and previous survey responses are often involved. Since cumulative effects of FL study are not always significant over the short term of a year, long-term evaluations are more useful to determine "trends in achievement in certain skill areas" (1985, p. 48).

A final report, says Schinke-Llano, should be compiled after discussion and further analysis of results. This report should then be disseminated to the appropriate people. She notes that though this step may seem obvious, it is amazing, after all the time and expense invested in program evaluation, how many program evaluation reports are scarcely read at all.

Schinke-Llano summarizes:

> Both the goals of a given early foreign language program and the purposes for which an evaluation is intended will determine the evaluation design. However, a school district that wishes to collect the most meaningful data possible should make every effort to use a variety of approaches in assessing the effectiveness of a program. When feasible, for example, both short-term and long-term studies should be designed; both formative and summative evaluations should be considered; both product- and process-oriented evaluation questions should be asked. Finally, a variety of data-gathering tools should be used.
>
> In addition, all those who are potentially or actually affected by the evaluation must be informed at all stages of the process. Such dissemination of information may not only facilitate the evaluation process, but also lead to a receptive response to results. (1985, pp. 54-55)

Heining-Boyton concludes:

> The judged effectiveness of an educational program depends on more than the level of student achievement. Program assessment provides information based on observations and perceptions of teachers, administrators, students, and parents that attest to the merit or worth of the offerings. It is crucial to the continued life and well-being of FLES to complete timely, thorough, and organized self-evaluations. Effective program

> appraisals contribute vital knowledge about the health of FLES as well as concrete documentation of successes. Administrators, school board members, and others in decision-making positions must frequently be made aware of a district's outstanding FLES programs. The goal is to insure a permanent place in the elementary curricula for foreign language study. (1991, p. 74)

Parent and School Community Awareness And Support

Met names advocacy as "Priority One" in her "Priorities for the 1990s" article on FLES instruction. Here is a list of the parties whose support Met says the profession must garner, and whom the profession must inform of the basic program models and the goals and expectations of those models: "the nation's decision makers at all levels of government... parents...members of the business community...the professional language community...school administrators...program coordinators...school board members, communities, leaders in business, government and education agencies..." (1990, p. 435).

Lipton devotes an entire chapter to "PR for FLES*" in her 1992 guide to FLES programs. She has a very broad notion of the community that needs to know about a district's FLES program. Other than the groups already mentioned above, she mentions: "students in the school and in feeder schools...grandparents...faculty of universities...taxpayer groups...religious groups, senior citizen groups, educational associations, veterans groups, former students, scouts, fraternal organizations, international organization, travel agencies...guidance counselors...others" (p. 210).

A supportive community must be a well-informed community. The community--parents, teachers, language teachers, district administrators and building administrators, even clerical staff--must be informed and kept informed from the beginning stages of the planning of the program (Schinke-Llano, 1985). "Once programs are implemented, language teachers and

administrators must continually cultivate parental and community support. The accomplishments of students must be publicized...." (Tegarden & Brown, 1989, p. 91).

FLES teachers, coordinators and advocates must seek support for FLES from other professionals in the elementary school:

> Since one teacher is primarily responsible for classroom instruction, that teacher is crucial to the success of efforts to integrate specialized instruction into the classroom. Principals must be supportive of instructional innovation if the novelty is to become institutionalized. School districts must be convinced of the value of something new if that new area is to survive periodic budgetary shortfalls...Not only would language study be related to other disciplines, but advocates for elementary language programs would have to address the concerns of principals, curriculum directors, and superintendents. (Müller, 1989, p. viii)

Tegarden and Brown (1989) remind us that, in spite of evidence that FL proficiency is and will be a necessary tool for many professions in the global marketplace and that young children benefit from early FL study, some administrators, classroom teachers and parents will be "dead set against" the idea of elementary FL. Their advice:

> Some of the reluctance toward the early study of foreign languages can be reduced by careful planning and by honestly addressing the concerns of skeptics. Other fears, those related to historical, political, and personal events probably cannot be eliminated. Those who advocate K-12 programs must identify and cultivate the supporters, sway the undecided, and not spend too much time trying to convince those who are actively opposed. (p. 80)

Curtain & Pesola (1994) see building public relations on an ongoing basis as part of the role of the foreign language coordinator and believe that giving a program visibility and communicating successes is well worth the effort. They recommend the following:

> (a) Making use of the media to provide publicity;
> (b) taking field trips;
> (c) inviting parents and others to visit classes;
> (d) videotaping classes and specific class projects to share with parent groups and administrators;
> (e) reporting class activities to parents, to the principal, and to other teachers;
> (f) sending out a monthly newsletter;
> (g) taking part in school programs;
> (h) putting on a special program for parents and/or for the community;

> (i) sending second-language invitations and greeting cards as a class writing activity. (p. 275)

Lipton (1992) takes PR far beyond the smaller school community by way of the media, recommending that programs "plan for publicity a before, during and after an event...designate a contact person, establish personal contacts in the media" (p. 211), send out short, accurate press releases featuring interesting or unusual story possibilities. Her list of ways that teachers, students and administrators can advocate FL includes many imaginative and diverse ideas from making and wearing buttons about the program to giving assignments for students to teach others phrases in the target language to inviting foreign language speakers to talk to classes. I will not list all the PR ideas that Lipton does; suffice it to say that there are scores of diverse ways to promote FLES in the community that can eventually play a role in maintaining the program when budgets tighten or nay-sayers are vocal.

Providing goals and rewards for FLES students, like the opportunity to study abroad, can boost public support for FLES programs (Tegarden & Brown, 1989). For example, Eugene, Oregon's continuing partial immersion French middle school gives selected students a chance to study three weeks in France at the end of grade 8 (Wing, 1996).

Contact with the target culture can culminate in an event that is motivating for students, parents, and makes great press. A Minneapolis middle school French class and a group of *cours moyen* students, of about nine to eleven years of age, from Brest, France maintained two-year-long e-mail and live on-line exchange. Though the French youngsters were working-class and the Americans. upper-middle class, the classes collaborated on writing a bilingual play together. The exchange culminated in members of the two groups meeting in Minneapolis to stage the play (Shelley, 1996).

Public relations for programs is an ongoing effort, according to Madeline Ehrlich, National Vice-Chairman and founder of ALL. Erlich told me, at the 1996 ALL National conference in Detroit, that though districts frequently provide orientation for parents in the initial years of a program's existence, misunderstandings sometimes develop over issues the staff of the FL program thought their parents have long understood. According to Erlich, this happens because after a few years, program advocates are dealing with a whole new group of people, who also need orientation as FLES or immersion parents (personal communication, October, 26, 1996).

Discussion

I agree with most, if not all, of the recommendations I chose to record in my review of literature; indeed, I found little in the literature that I believed to be without any merit. In discussing the review of literature I have conducted, I cannot but bring to the discussion all of my experiences touching FLES: my experience as a FLES educator, in both immersion and sequential FLES programs; my experience as a substitute secondary FL teacher and as a substitute elementary classroom teacher, the university training I have received in secondary FL education and in general elementary education; the inservice training I received as a FLES teacher; the conversations I have had with other FL, FLES and non-FL educators; and my recent experiences as part of the steering committee in two districts planning FLES programs.

Concerning setting goals for FLES and planning programs, goals and objectives set within reason are not a guarantee of a healthy, viable elementary foreign language program. I think it cannot be overemphasized that, in selling the idea of a FLES program to the community, advocates must be cautious that they do not promise more than they can deliver. Those

developing curriculum and assessment instruments must remember all of the rationales for developing a program and include affective goals and non-linguistic goals in their expected outcomes or objectives. Contrary to what many may believe, the ultimate indication of a FLES program's success is not measured in student proficiency, but in the degree to which the students and their parents know the program goals, believe that the goals are worth striving for and the degree to which those goals have been met.

Those programs that place the attainment of a given level of proficiency as a primary goal must be realistic and conservative in projecting expected proficiency. Unfortunately, the literature does not provide much guidance in this crucial area, except a few studies on the linguistic and subject area performance of immersion students. The sample progress indicators in *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* do not provide the number of hours of FL study needed to perform the tasks described. ACTFL's standards, which I found in the Summer/Fall 1992 issue of FLESNEWS, are the only standards I found that included the number of hours of study after which outcomes named can be expected. The practical application of these standards, though, is limited, because (a) they do not specify levels of accuracy expected for content and functions, (b) they describe expected outcomes for a particular distribution of hours of study over grade levels that could only correspond to a very limited number of actual FLES programs; and (c) they do not provide the needed scale or yardstick, comparable to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines. The determinations of the level of proficiency that we can reasonably expect after a given number of hours must therefore still be based largely on observations made during visits to existing programs, information gathered from existing programs and anecdotal information.

I firmly believe that Met does not exaggerate in her requirements for a qualified FLES teacher. Universities are slowly beginning to offer individual courses for FLES. For languages

commonly spoken by bilingual education teachers and classroom teachers, such as Spanish, there is the possibility of retraining teachers who already possess many of the qualifications of a successful FLES teacher.

The greatest staffing challenge to districts starting programs is to provide leadership for transplanted teachers and new hires into new FLES programs. Even when a teacher takes university courses designed to meet the need for FLES teachers, a single degree in elementary education or in foreign language, with a couple of specially designed FLES courses does not a FLES program coordinator or head FLES teacher make. Even teachers who have had years of experience in English as a Second Language, though their expertise in language acquisition is an asset, will face entirely new challenges when teaching a language that is not frequently spoken outside of school. Without leadership from experienced FLES educators, districts risk having their good planning go to waste if the teachers they hire to implement the program get off on the wrong foot with no one to monitor their program except off-site or non-FL speaking administrators. Also, having teaching experience in FLES does not guarantee a teacher has the same vision as district planners. A sequential FLES teacher may not have any idea how to integrate content into the FL curriculum or teach content in the FL. Many experienced FLES teachers come from sequential FLES programs, while content-based FLES seems to be gaining in popularity because of the advantages of integrating FL into the curriculum.

As for hiring and maintaining qualified teachers, districts must be creative. I know of FLES program steering committees that literally want to start FLES programs without hiring any additional staff! Districts need to look at their overall hiring practices and, if possible, hire elementary-certified candidates that will welcome FL in the classroom, if not teach it themselves. The talents of current staff need to be utilized, both for fiscal economy and to

promote good relations within the district for the FLES program. Anyone involved in teaching in the FLES program, though, should be bought in knowing the methods and philosophy of the program. Contracts between district and teacher's unions may dictate that a teacher who has certification in the area of a vacant position has the right to transfer into the vacant position before new staff is hired; it is up to program planners, district administrators and coordinators to make clear what the position entails, so that transfers as well as new hires form a FLES staff that is in accord about what FLES means in their district.

Training of existing FLES staff at the district level must be supplemented with training offered by organizations on the national level. While teachers of most disciplines provided adequate professional development opportunities by the district training programs or those available through intermediate school districts, the FLES educator's collegial community is a nation-wide one. There are probably only as many FLES educators in the entire country as their are elementary school teachers in a single, large, local school district! Workshops at the National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center and conferences like ALL and NNELL must be included in the program budget as part of teacher training. FLES educators I have met at ALL conferences have more than once told me that participation at such conferences is the only thing that keeps them going, "that, and the kids, of course".

Though it is not among the imperatives listed by Lipton, Heining-Boyton, Rosenbusch, or Curtain & Pesola, all recognize the value of FL program coordinator who has little or no teaching responsibilities and who can devote his or her time to staff development and maintenance, training, curriculum development oversight, coordination of schedules and relations with non-FL teaching staff, materials selection and materials production, articulation issues, public relations and publicity, keeping staff in touch with professional organizations,

training and funding opportunities outside of the district, and helping staff keep up to date developments in the FL field world-wide. Districts planning programs need to investigate how some of these issues may affect their program choices. Also, program coordinators should be aware of the ways in which outside agencies-- universities, professional organizations and their research journals, national agencies, such as the Center for Applied Linguistics-- can offer information to give their programs unity, direction and perspective. It is individual districts with existing programs that will lead the way to improvements in FLES on the state and national level, by participating with colleges at a national level, publishing materials and research. Though there are no studies on the subject to my knowledge, I believe a good program coordinator will pay for his or herself in hours saved hiring and training new staff to replace those lost to burn-out from teaching without leadership. Also, if the coordinator keeps a program afloat, the savings realized in maintaining a smooth-running program over losing a botched program is considerable.

The necessity of using age-appropriate and sound FL pedagogy to teach FLES is so obvious it is amazing that it features so prominently in the literature about program implementation and needs to be discussed at all. I believe that if FLES teachers are trained to use current methodologies and are as familiar with the elementary curriculum as any other elementary school teacher, the pedagogy issue is all but solved. Since one of the main advantages young learners have over adolescents is in the affective domain, FLES curriculum planners should not set goals, like teaching grammar or content that is too young for students, that will undermine teachers' efforts to make the most of the affective advantage.

A word about materials, I have seen FLES and immersion teachers so desperate to have materials which they did not have to make or translate themselves that they have bought and

used materials that did not fit their students' needs or the philosophy of their programs. Though there are materials available for purchase to adapt to individual district programs, teacher-produced materials are a fact of life in FLES. Materials production is a sorely underestimated drain on teacher energy and time and should be accounted for in scheduling and student load if burn-out is to be prevented.

Studies on the results of content-based FLES, both for language acquisition and content learning are needed for us to move away from experimental methodology. Content-based FLES sounds great and attractively economical in these times of high demands on the dollar and the minute for learning. Also, teaching elementary school subjects today is not what it used to be and re-trained secondary teachers who may base their teaching methods on their own elementary school experiences will not have much success in today's elementary classroom. Unlike experienced elementary classroom teachers trained years ago, transplanted FLES teachers have not had inservice opportunities to retrain them in new methods for teaching content. Content-based FLES requires *extensive* curriculum development, particularly in the years that a program is extending up or down through the grades. Elementary classroom teaching experience and knowledge of the elementary curriculum is an absolute necessity for at least part of the curriculum writing team. Those districts that plan to work in content-related language instruction when they can probably won't, especially if they have no coordinator and teachers with heavy teaching loads. In order for a district to realize all of the benefits of content-based instruction, regular collaboration time must be scheduled for classroom and FLES teachers. Additional support of institutionalized partnerships or mentors and target language content area "specialists" among experienced FL teachers and other ideas to integrate the FL and the FL teacher into the school day may also prove helpful.

I believe that articulation with secondary programs and the support and acceptance of FLES programs by secondary FL teachers is the imperative that will ultimately determine whether the current interest in FLES will produce the first permanent inclusion of FLES into educational programs or if FLES in the 90s will be a passing fad reserved for a few districts. I also believe that articulation or secondary programs with FLES will determine whether enrollment in FL at the secondary level will continue to be more or less limited to the academic elite or we will, at last, have FL for all students. Meeting the imperatives named by researchers and leading professional FLES educators will undoubtedly save districts from unexpected expense and poor results, in both in planning and running FLES programs. It is nevertheless useful to have an overarching, guiding principle, one that will ultimately shore in the majority of concerns. From all I have seen, heard, and read, I believe the guiding principle that will best help satisfy all of FLES' exigencies and make secondary FL education fit into the lives of a larger part of the student population is valuing the language acquisition and FL curriculum development processes.

In education as a whole there has been a shift in beliefs about what learning is and what is worthwhile to learn. This shift is apparent in most schools and classrooms where there are resources and administrative vision enough to look into the next century. The product of learning, once the tangible prize of our efforts and our students' efforts, is no longer a sufficient end. The value once placed on product must now be accorded the process of learning. Keeping the language acquisition process central in our efforts will allow us to meet most of the challenges before us as planners and executors of FLES programs. Curtain & Pesola observe this same movement in FL education:

> There is a compelling thrust from the insights of second language acquisition research from the communicative competence movement, from the experience with immersion

> programs, from cognitive psychology, and from content-based instruction: meaningful communication in the context of a holistic approach to learning. This principal replaces the grammatical focus so common in secondary and postsecondary language programs, and the emphasis on memorization and recitation that has frequently characterized language instruction in the elementary school. The orientation toward communication places language learning in a living laboratory, in which process is the primary focus of planning and instruction. (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 97

As educators, we must meet new standards. Whereas once only a few, mostly male, mostly left-brained, mostly white people were taught how to think and learn in our schools, now technology and the nature of the workplace make it necessary for us to teach all of our students how to learn and to value the learning process, in addition to products of learning. Like the 286 model personal computer, today's products of learning may be obsolete before very long. The necessity of teaching learners who learn differently coupled with the impossibility for us to predict what our students must know in their future world have made the learning process the focus of the classroom of the 21st century.

In the FL profession, the shift from product to process has been a particularly painful one. Professional FL educators, experienced and proficient in teaching verb conjugations and appreciation of the works of literary masters to the "best and the brightest", have lived to see the world come to the doors of their classrooms and knock. When their students opened the door and met a native speaker of their target language, few could maintain a conversation in the target language.

Jeffrey Munks (1996) urges us to rethink the foundations of our current instructional objectives for FL at all levels of our educational system:

> If the stated instructional objective of languages other than English in our nation's education system is strictly focused on the intrinsic value of exposure to other cultures, customs, and languages, then there is a measure of relevance to the current approach. That relevance is perhaps most valued inside the sector that promotes it: education itself. (p.7)

Munks points to an "inordinate" emphasis of the system on language majors. He paints a picture of a corps of language teachers simply replacing itself with new recruits for an "18th century, eurocentric literary tradition" (p. 8). According to Munks, former language students of both public and private institutions, as well as proprietary programs found in the public sector, are often disappointed in the product of their study. The aims of the majority of language programs in the US and the expectations of the students don't match up: in reality, these mostly traditional programs aim to "expand horizons" and "teach low-level social conventions", whereas students often believe that after a few years in such a program, they will be able to speak the language fluently. When the student fails to communicate in a target language situation, "...the result is an incremental devaluation of the system that produced this nonspeaker" (p.8).

FLES cannot exist "on a cultural island" in the elementary school; neither can FLES' potential be realized if secondary program planners continue to rely almost on mass-produced textbook series, which, though improved from a communicative standpoint, cannot meet the input and relevancy needs of FLES graduates.

As I pointed out in the articulation section of the review of literature in this paper, Met had a change of opinion as to whether the aural/oral/vocabulary emphasis of FLES and the reading/writing/grammar emphasis of secondary FL programs produced a match or mismatch when articulating the two types of programs. Originally, she believed that FLES graduates would bring a foundation of vocabulary, good pronunciation, listening skills to high school, so grammar reading and writing would be richer and more engaging. Many, many FLES programs and secondary programs are articulated on this premise.

Met later reversed this opinion and for the same reasons that many secondary FL teachers have changed or ultimately must change their philosophies and practices when faced with the differently proficient, more heterogeneous student population FLES brings to them. As FLES becomes more widespread, secondary FL teachers will have abandon methods they have been improving upon for years and find a new basis for teaching language. In the worst of scenarios, FLES as an extension of a failed methodology dooms FLES to failure. In the best secondary programs, FLES will challenge secondary teachers, like FLES teachers themselves, to begin writing their own curriculum and exploring content-based FL teaching at the secondary level.

The adoption of an approach to language acquisition that is based on neither grammar nor drill is particularly difficult for established FL teachers because many of us learned our second languages using grammar-translation or audiolingual methods. "If the old methods worked for us, shouldn't they work for everyone?", we are tempted to reason Such reasoning is faulty because, as students, we were rare birds in our FL classrooms: most of our peers did not become fluent FL speakers as a result of the same training that began our road to fluency.

Perhaps it is in some way consistent with children's cognitive development to keep FLES curriculum limited to vocabulary and oral/aural development and a watered-down version of grammar-based methods and then reveal grammar to them once they have reached the average age at which children begin using abstract reasoning. The problem with this basis for FL for curriculum development and articulation of instruction is that, in our current media-saturated culture, the lessons that emerge from this basis are basically dry and boring to all but the youngest learners or the most avid foreign language "geeks". An energetic, enthusiastic FL teacher can only charm a limited number of young people into learning a beloved language. If

our goal is truly to be foreign language for all, motivation for learning language must derive from a more mainstream interest or concern.

Student assessment and content and performance standards are the current areas in FL education that are receiving the most attention. I believe that the document *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century* will change our profession, and for the better. One important change: The needs of FLES students and educators are finally being considered by the profession as a whole. Because FL educators recognized that being the sole discipline included in Goals 2000 to begin its mandated content standards at grade nine would harm any possibility of a stronger position for FL in the core curriculum, standards for grade four, implying study previous to grade four, have been included in the Standards. Elementary school FL has been brought into the fold and stands to benefit from the underguirding the Standards will provide not only for assessment, but for all areas of FL education in the future.

Clearly, there is great need of testing students in existing programs, using one or more widely-accepted instruments, so that the results of using a particular program design can be disseminated. Though program designs are varied, if enough of them were evaluated in terms of student proficiency levels attained, we might be able to draw more conclusions about what works and what doesn't, what works well, what works better and why. There are testing instruments available, such as those found in Lynn Thompson's bibliography. FLES programs need to contribute to the knowledge in the field by taking the time and expense to test students. Moreover, testing and program evaluation results are not only worthwhile for the sake of information dissemination on a national level, on a local level, results can be a valuable public relations tool.

Though standardized testing or at least widespread application of a small number of testing instruments could prove beneficial to FL study on a national level and to demonstrate FL proficiency of FLES students to their community, I believe FLES educators need to consider the type of alternative assessments Thompson describes. As a means of communicating student progress to students and their parents, alternative assessment is valuable in FLES for the same reasons it is valuable in other elementary subjects: (a) it links curriculum and assessment directly; (b) it often gives more information about student work than a pen and paper test; and (c) it allows for students to own their assessments and take responsibility for assessment on a daily basis.

Perhaps the new Standards document will result in the development of a more widely-recognized testing instrument during the next decade. The framework provided by the Standards document is more comprehensive than any content framework we have ever had. The elevation of other content areas to a level equal with communication will almost certainly affect assessment, as well as goals and objectives for FLES in the future.

Public relations must be taken seriously by FLES planners. There is some disagreement in the literature about when various players--parents, building principals, classroom teachers--should be included in planning and implementing a new FLES program. I believe a planners must know their own parents, teachers, and administrators, and such familiarity is most likely when representatives of all interested groups are part of the steering committee. In one district, the majority of parents might expect the details to be ironed out before they are presented with a FLES program; in another the same action would be interpreted by a majority of parents as exclusion of parents during the planning process.

Finally, the problem of fitting FLES into an already packed school day is a potential public relations disaster when classroom teachers are asked to give up precious minutes of instruction with their students. Having been in the position of a classroom teacher, I can sympathize with teachers and parents who may not think there is time for FLES. Every provision that decreases the loss of homeroom teacher contact time due to the addition of FLES in the school day should be considered a public relations "plus". For example, opting for the traveling FLES teacher to avoid loosing classroom instructional time might be worth the loss of convenience to the FLES teacher and the loss of the target language environment the FLES teacher can create in his or her own classroom. Moreover, solving any existing problems in school or schedule by adding FLES will help staff and parents to welcome the addition of FLES. For example, FLES may provide planning or release time for classroom teachers or FLES may be the subject taught in order to satisfy the lengthening of the school day which is in the works in many districts.

At this writing, the FLES profession is anxiously awaiting the publication of Rhodes and Oxford's new national survey on FLES and secondary FL programs in the US and the Center for Applied Linguistics' National Directory of Early Language Learning Programs, both due to be available in 1997. The information from the survey and the directory will undoubtedly provide answers to many questions districts have about starting and maintaining FLES programs and provide sources for answers to questions not answered directly in their pages.

Conclusions

In planning FLES programs, no matter the program model, districts must satisfy the following imperatives if their programs are to thrive: setting realistic goals and planning programs that will meet those goals, locating and retaining qualified teachers, using materials

and methods that are both age-appropriate and based on sound second language acquisition theory, using content-based instruction to ensure a place in the overall school program, articulating the FLES program with existing FL programs, assessing students frequently, evaluating the entire program on a regular basis and involving the community in the program, both by educating the community about FLES's value on an ongoing basis and celebrating the successes of the program with community participation or in the public eye.

FL education as a whole is affected by the expansion of FLES and advances in FLES methodology. As a profession we have more to gain than to lose by working together to teach our students language over an extended sequence of years, both in terms of enrollment and student proficiency. FLES programs need the support of classroom teachers and secondary FL teachers in equal amounts.

Districts must rely on sources in addition to professional journals to gather information about the establishment and maintenance of strong programs. Districts that have FLES programs would benefit from being involved in the nation-wide FLES community. FLES teachers and program coordinators should be encouraged to conduct field studies, student testing and program evaluations and to publish their results. Such contributions to the body of knowledge about our profession will lead to a better understanding of how language is best taught in our schools, as well as to demonstrate the success of our programs to the community.

References

Allen, V. G. (1989). The integrated curriculum: rethinking elementary school language programs for the 90's. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary schools (pp. 14-27). New York: The American Forum.

Andersson, T. (1969). Foreign languages in the elementary school: a struggle against mediocrity. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Andrade, C., Kretschmer, R. R. Jr., & Kretschmer, L. W. (1989). Two languages for all: Expanding to low achievers and the handicapped. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary school (pp. 177-204). New York: The American Forum.

Asher, J., & Garcia, R. (1982). The optimal age to learn a foreign language. In S. Krashen, R. Scarcella, and M. Long, (Eds.), Child-adult differences in second language acquisition (pp. 3-2). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bagg, G. C. & Oates, M. D. (1984). Building community support through a Spanish FLES program. Hispania, 67, 105-108.

Bamford, K. (1991). Cognitive and language development of Spanish immersion children. FLESNEWS, 4(4), 4-5.

Carpenter, J. & Torney, J. (1973). Beyond the melting pot. In P. N. Markun & J. L. Land (Eds.), Children and international education. Washington, DC; Association for Childhood Education International.

Chapman, M. , Grob, E. & Haas, M. (1989). The ages and learning stages of children and their implications for foreign language learning. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary school (pp. 27-65). New York: The American Forum.

Cibulsky, C.M. (1994). Criteria for evaluating foreign language teaching materials. FLESNEWS, 7(3), 1, 5.

Connor-Linton, J. (1996). The Arlington curriculum development model. Foreign Language Annals, 29, 139-151.

Crandall, J. & Willetts, K. (1986). A CLEAR-sponsored seminar. ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, 9(2), 1,7-8.

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. TESOL Quarterly, 14, 175-87.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Schooling and language minority students: A

theoretical framework. (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles, CA: California State University, National Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Curtain, H. & Haas, M. (1995, April). Integrating foreign language and content instruction in grades K-8. ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Curtain, H. & Pesola, C. (1988). Languages and children: Making the match. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Curtain, H. & Pesola, C. (1994). Languages and children: Making the match (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Fortune, T. & Jorstad, H. L. (1996). U.S. immersion programs: A national survey. Foreign Language Annals, 29, 163-190.

Foster, K. & Reeves, C. (1988). FLES improves cognitive skills. FLESNEWS, 2(3), 4-5.

Genesee, F. (1987). Learning through two languages. Rowley, MA: Newbury House 1987.

Gray, T., Rhodes. N., Campbell, R., & Snow, M. (1984). Comparative evaluation of elementary school foreign language programs. Final report. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 255)

Hamayan, E. (1986, November). How language competent are Americans? ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Heining-Boyton, A. (1988). Current foreign language in the elementary school programs in the state of Michigan. Foreign Language Annals, 21, 241-251.

Heining-Boyton, A. (1990). Using FLES history to plan for the present and future. Foreign Language Annals, 23, 503-509.

Heining-Boyton, A. (1991). FLES program evaluation: rationale and procedural design. In R. M. Terry (Ed.), Acting on priorities: A commitment to excellence. Chapel Hill, NC: Southern Conference on Language Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 850)

Hoegl, J. (1984). National and state needs for foreign language learning in government, business, tourism, and agriculture. (Report No. FL-015-154). Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 588)

Jackson, C. W. (1996). National standards and the challenge of articulation. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), Foreign language for all: Challenges and choices (Northeast Conference Reports). (pp. 115-140). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Kennedy, D. F. & De Lorenzo, W. (1985). Complete guide to exploratory foreign language programs. Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). The Imput Hypothesis: Issues and implications. New York: Longman.

Krashen, S. (1982b). Accounting for child-adult differences in second language rate and attainment. In S. Krashen, R. Scarcella, and M. Long, (Eds.), Child-adult differences in second language acquisition (pp. 202-226). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Krashen, S. (1983). Principles and practice of second language acquisition. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. Scarcella, R. & Long, M. (Eds.). (1982). Child-adult differences in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lambert, W. & Klienberg, O. (1967). Children's views of foreign people. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Landry, R. G. (1973). The enhancement of figural creativity through second language learning at the elementary school level. Foreign Language Annals, 7, 111-115.

Lipton, G. (1990). A look back...a look ahead. Hispania, 73, 256-258.

Lipton, G. (1991). FLES* (K-8) programs for the year 2000.... Hispania, 74, 1084-1086.

Lipton, G. (1992). Practical handbook to elementary foreign language programs (FLES*): Including *Sequential FLES, FLEX,* and *immersion* programs. Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Co.

Long, M. Native speaker/non-native speaker: Conversation in the second language classroom. In M. Clarke and J Handscomb (Eds.) On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language earning and teaching. (pp. 207-225). Washington DC. TESOL.

Masciantonio, R. (1977). Tangible benefits of the study of Latin: A review of research. Foreign Language Annals, 10, 375-382.

Met, M. (1985). Decisions! Decisions! Decisions! Foreign language in the elementary school. Foreign Language Annals, 18, 469-473.

Met, M. (1989). Learning language through content: learning content through language. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary schools (pp. 43-65). New York: The American Forum.

Met, M. (1989b). Walking on water and other characteristics of effective elementary school teachers. Foreign Language Annals, 22, 175-181.

Met, M. (1990). Elementary school foreign language start up costs: FLES and immersion. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

Met, M. & Rhodes, N. (1990). Elementary school foreign language instruction: Priorities for the 1990's. Foreign Language Annals, 23, 433-443.

Müller, K. E. (Ed.). (1989). Languages in elementary schools. New York: The American Forum.

Müller, K. E. (1989). Policy and curricular implications of expanding language education in elementary schools. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary schools. (pp. 204-223). New York: The American Forum.

Munks, J. J. (1996). The case for multilingual citizens in the 21st century. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), Foreign language for all: Challenges and choices (Northeast Conference Reports). (pp. 1-20). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century. Lawrence, KS: Author.

Staff. (1992-93, Winter). NNELL networking discussion groups report. FLESNEWS, 7(2), p. 3.

Oller, J. W. Jr., (1989). Testing and elementary foreign language programs. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary schools. (pp. 99-157). New York: The American Forum.

Olson, L. & Samuels, S. J. (1973). The relationship between age and accuracy of foreign language pronunciation. Journal of Educational Research, 66, 263-267.

Omaggio, A. C. (1986). Teaching languages in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Pesola C. A. & Curtain H. A. (1989). Elementary school languages: perspectives, practices, and promises. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary schools (pp. 1-14). New York: The American Forum.

Rhodes, N. C. & Oxford, R. (1988). Foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools: a national survey. Foreign Language Annals, 21, 51-69.

Rhodes, N.C., Tucker, G. R., & Clark, J. L. D. (1981). Elementary school foreign language instruction in the United States: Innovative approaches for the 1980s. Final

Report. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 904)

Rosenbusch, M. (1985). FLES: an important step in the right direction. Hispania, 68, 174-176.

Rosenbusch, M. (1991). Elementary school foreign language: The establishment and maintenance of strong programs. Foreign Language Annals, 24, 297-314.

Rosenbusch, M. (1992). Colloquium on Foreign Languages in the Elementary School Curriculum-Proceedings 1991. Munich: Goethe Institut.

Rosenbusch, M. (1995, June). Guidelines for starting an elementary school foreign language program. ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Rosenbusch, M. (1995). Elementary teachers critique K-4 benchmarks of the national standards. FLESNEWS, 8, (3), 10-12.

Schinke-Llano, L. (1985). Foreign language in the elementary school: State of the art. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Shelley, J. O. (1996). Minneapolis and Brittany: Children bridge geographical and social differences through technology. Learning Languages, 2(1). 3-11.

Skinner, M. (1992). MICHFLES eases the transition to elementary school. FLESNEWS, 6 (1), 4-6.

Spaar, V. (1968). FLES in retrospect. In H. Bourque (Ed.), The FLES Student: A study. (pp. 57-72). New York: Chilton Books.

Snow, C. & Hoefnagel-Höhle, M. (1977). Age difference and the pronunciation of foreign sounds. Language and Speech, 20, 245-253.

Snow, C. & Hoefnagel-Höhle, M. (1978). The critical period for language acquisition: evidence from second language learning. Child Development, 49, 1114-1128.

Snow, M. A., Met, M. & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 23 (2), 201-217.

Spinelli, E. (1996). Meeting the challenges of a diverse secondary school population. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), Foreign language for all: Challenges and choices (Northeast Conference Reports). (pp. 57-87). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Staff. (1992-93). Standards proposed for foreign language education. FLESNEWS, 2(6), p. 8.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), Input in Second Language Acquisition. (pp. 235-253). Series in second language research. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Strength through wisdom: a critique of U.S. capability. (1979). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1982). Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Tegarden, S. R. & Brown, C. L. (1989) School-district perspectives on elementary-school language programs. In K. E. Müller (Ed.), Languages in elementary schools. (pp. 79-99). New York: The American Forum.

Thompson, L. (1995). K-8 foreign language assessment: A bibliography. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wilson, J. A. (1988, November). Foreign language program articulation: Building bridges from elementary to secondary school. ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wing, B. H. (Ed.). (1996). Foreign language for all: Challenges and choices (Northeast Conference Reports). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Wing, B. H. (1996). Starting early: Foreign languages in the elementary and middle schools. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), Foreign language for all: Challenges and choices (Northeast Conference Reports). (pp. 21-56). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.